The Reformation

A Series of Articles Published
in *The Tidings*

(November, 1916—May, 1917)

By THE EDITOR

ALMA COLLEGE
Alma, California
Library of
University of Santa Clara

Los Angeles
WAYSIDE PRESS
311 East Fourth Street
1917

ALMA COLLEGE
270.6
LIBRARY
An7B
Alma, California

2667

Nihil Obstat
F. A. Ruppert, S. J.,
Censor Deputatus
Imprimatur
Patrick Harnett,
Administrator
Los Angeles, October 1, 1917

Contents

I.
The Ideal of Christendom 4

II.
Early Causes 10

III.
The Great Schism of the West. Wyclif and Hus 17

IV.
The Renaissance 26

V.
The Renaissance Pontiffs 32

VI.
German Humanism; Erasmus 39

VII.
The Nature of the Church. Luther..... 45

VIII.
Luther and Tetzel 51

IX.
Luther's Break with Rome..... 58

X.
Luther's German Bible. Disturbances..... 64

XI.
Adrian VI. The Peasants' War..... 72

XII.
Luther's Marriage. Progress of the Reformation 83

XIII.
How the Reformation Spread. The Reformation in Switzerland. The Anabaptists..... 92

XIV.
The Wars of Charles V. 104

Contents (Continued)

XV.
The Reformation in Scandinavia..... 115

XVI.
Calvin 125

XVII.
The Reformation in France: I. 134

XVIII.
The Reformation in France: II. 141

XIX.
The Reformation in France: III. 148

XX.
The Reformation in the Netherlands..... 153

XXI.
The Reformation in England..... 164

XXII.
Suppression of Monasteries and Guilds. Effects on Education 172

XXIII.
Edward VI. and Mary Tudor..... 183

XXIV.
The Reign of Elizabeth and After..... 192

XXV.
The Reformation in Ireland..... 202

XXVI.
The Reformation in Scotland..... 208

XXVII.
The Reformation in Poland and Other Countries 215

XXVIII.
The Council of Trent 220

XXIX.
Effects of the Reformation..... 224

Foreword

October 31, 1917, will be the four hundredth anniversary of the nailing of Luther's Ninety-five Theses to the door of the castle church of Wittenberg,—an event which is held, in a certain sense, to mark the beginning of the great religious revolt commonly called the Reformation. Although the war has interfered in no small degree with the many ambitious plans for the observance of this quadricentennial anniversary, sufficient public attention has been drawn to it, locally, to justify the republication of the following papers, which appeared in **The Tidings** from November, 1916, to May, 1917.

An effort has been made to sketch the course of the Reformation as completely as possible; yet in a booklet of such small compass only the high points (if the expression may be used) can be touched. As the articles were written from week to week, there has necessarily been some repetition, and the same reason can be assigned for a certain roughness of style. However, it has been deemed inadvisable, because of lack of time, to try to remedy either fault in this booklet.

It may be thought that the number and length of the several quotations are altogether out of due proportion; but this was unavoidable, since the plan of the articles called for ample substantiation of every point sought to be made. The quotations are taken largely from non-Catholic historians, most of whom were not friendly to the Church. The Catholic writers cited are all men of acknowledged authority in the historical field. With the exception of three or four only, every quotation has been verified at first hand, and in practically all cases an explicit reference is given.

—C. C. C.

I.

Elaborate preparations are being made by our non-Catholic friends to observe, with what they deem becoming circumstance, the quadricentenary of Luther's revolt from Rome. The subject of the so-called Reformation is a large one; but, in spite of its multiplicity of causes and numerous subsequent ramifications, it centers upon Martin Luther, the apostate monk whose life and deeds have been placed in so clear a light by the erudite if somewhat over-irritable work of the great Dominican historian, Denifle, and the equally learned though calmer masterpiece of the Jesuit Hartmann Grisar. As for Henry VIII. and the other agents of religious disunion, they have been amply and adequately dealt with by painstaking writers not of the Catholic fold, whose several testimonies we shall present to the reader in their proper place.

The Search for a Cause

No effect is without its cause. The axiom is never questioned in the natural order, but sometimes the incautious historian writes in a fashion which suggests that certain great movements, (and among them the Reformation), were spontaneous outbursts of spiritual fervor which can be accounted for only as a sort of heavenly inspiration. Others, more positive, find the cause in what they term the doctrinal corruption of the Christian Church, forgetful that Christ declared that against it the gates of hell would not prevail, and that, therefore, they place the Divine Founder of Christianity in the position either of a downright falsifier or a sorry dreamer,—attributes utterly inconsistent with His Godhead. And others again confuse personal abuses with doctrinal aberrations, asserting the existence of the latter on the ground that sundry ecclesiastics were not what they should have been,—a species of reasoning apparently reserved for questions of Church history. Doubtless, in the coming celebrations we shall see all these things gravely urged as if they were matters about which no doubt whatever can be entertained.

The conditions which led up to the Reformation, then, demand careful attention. No one of

them can properly be considered a sufficient cause; yet, taken in the aggregate, they gave such shape to the acts of Luther that a religious disturbance was inevitable. It must be remarked, however, that the genesis of the Reformation in England differed much from that of the German revolt, and the same thing may be said, **mutatis mutandis,** of the movement in the several other northern lands. By the word "conditions" we mean not only the events which were proximate to the Reformation, but we mean also those political and religious disturbances which had their origin one, two, three, and even four and more centuries before Martin Luther saw the light of day.

Christendom

At the bottom of many of the troubles recorded in history can be found the determination of the secular power not to recognize the Church as a perfect society, independent within its own sphere. This determination is not wanting in the great religious revolt of the sixteenth century; in fact, it is writ large all over it. We are therefore led to look for the first series of events which led up to the Reformation in those things that led to the destruction of the medieval theory of Christendom.

Now what was Christendom? It was the polity of European government in the Middle Ages, when all the nations were politically as well as religiously the members of the one great Christian family, the head of which was the Pope. In the language of the statesmen of those times, Christendom was figured in the theory of the two swords, the one spiritual, to be wielded by the Roman Pontiff; the other temporal, to be placed in the hands of the Roman Emperor. Each was supreme in his own sphere, though, of course, it was the duty of the Pope to determine what constituted the spiritual order and what the temporal, and to see that those temporalities appertaining to the spiritual power, and the spiritual power itself as well, were safeguarded from invasion or usurpation by the purely secular authorities. Whatever failures this splendid medieval concept of government may have suffered, it is beyond question that, taken all in all, it had

thorities. Whatever failures this splendid medieval a most beneficial effect upon the several peoples of Europe. Many of the blessings of liberty enjoyed by modern nations had their origin in those far-off, much abused times.

In fact, it was the Church which saved civilization at the time of the barbarian invasions. Listen to the non-Catholic French historian Guizot:

The Words of Guizot

"I do not think that I say more than the truth in affirming that, at the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth centuries, it was the Christian Church which saved Christianity. It was the Church with its institutions, its magistrates, and its power that vigorously resisted both the internal dissolution of the Empire and barbarism, . . . and became the principle of civilization between the Roman and the barbarian worlds." (La civilization en Europe, lect. ii.)

Again he says:

"The Church had moreover agitated all the great questions that concern man; she was solicitous about all the problems of his nature, about all the chances of his destiny. Hence her influence on modern civilization has been immense; greater, perhaps, than has been imagined by her most ardent adversaries or her most zealous advocates." (Ibid., lect. v.)

So it was out of this activity that Christendom was born when, on the Christmas Day of the year 800, Pope St. Leo III. crowned the Frankish King Charles (Charlemagne) Emperor of the West in St. Peter's at Rome. This is not the place to tell of the subsequent struggles of the Popes with faithless Emperors; suffice it here to say that the ideal was very nearly attained, especially in the reign of the great Pope Innocent III., when, in Kenneth Bell's phrase, "there was for once a United States of Europe."

Now let us see what this ideal of Christendom did for civilization. We shall quote two non-Catholic historians. First let us hear Canon Farrar:

"From the fifth to the thirteenth centuries the Church was engaged in elaborating the most splendid organization the world has ever seen. Starting with the separation of the spiritual from

the temporal power, and the mutual independence of each in its own sphere, Catholicism worked hand in hand with feudalism for the amelioration of mankind. Under the influence of feudalism, slavery became serfdom, and aggressive was modified into defensive war. Under the influence of Catholicism the monasteries preserved learning, and maintained the sense of the unity of Christendom. Under the combined influence of both grew up the lovely ideal of chivalry, moulding generous instincts into gallant institutions, making the body vigorous and the soul pure, and wedding the Christian virtues of humanity and tenderness into the natural grace of courtesy and strength. During this period the Church was the one mighty witness for light in an age of darkness, for order in an age of lawlessness, for personal holiness in an epoch of licentious rage. Amid the despotism of kings and the turbulence of aristocracies, it was an inestimable blessing that there should be a power which by the unarmed majesty of goodness made the haughtiest and the boldest respect the interests of justice, and tremble at the temperance, righteousness, and judgment to come." (Hulsean Lectures, The Victories of Christianity, page 115.)

What Lecky Says

Lecky is not less explicit:

"The Catholic Church was the very heart of Christendom, and the spirit that radiated from her penetrated into all the relations of life, and colored institutions it did not create. . . . As long as a church is so powerful as to form the intellectual condition of the age, to supply the standing-point from which every question is viewed, its authority will never be disputed. . . . This ascendancy was gained in medieval society more completely than by any other system before or since, and the stage of civilization that resulted from it was one of the most important in the evolutions of society. By consolidating the heterogeneous and anarchical elements that succeeded the downfall of the Roman Empire, by infusing into Christendom a bond of unity that is superior to the divisions of nationhood, and a moral tie that is superior to force, by softening slavery into serfdom and preparing the

way for the ultimate emancipation of labor, Catholicism laid the foundations of modern civilization." (History of Rationalism, vol. ii., page 37.)

We will now quote a Catholic writer, the convert W. S. Lilly, who says that, in those times, "throughout Europe the whole structure of man's life, both public and private, was built upon religion. . . . In the Middle Ages . . . the religion of Europe was individual; it could not but be so, for it dealt primarily with each one's conscience; its call was personally addressed to each soul. But that call was into a spiritual kingdom, in which each soul found its own portion and inheritance. Thus the medieval conception of religion was also national: all Christian men were 'cives sanctorum,' subjects of the 'Civitas Dei,' the world-wide kingdom of Him to whom had been given 'the heathen for His inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession' . . . Hence Christendom, rather than the particular region of it in which they happened to dwell, was regarded as their true country and the first object of their patriotism. The rigid lines of demarcation which in the ancient world had separated races, and had made the words enemy and stranger synonymous, were broken down. The phrase 'Christian commonwealth' was a reality, and the several European states were sections of it. For the first time in the world's history, as a learned writer (De Renzi) has well observed, 'we see not merely man, but humanity. The citizen and the helot, Greeks and barbarians, have disappeared, and in their place is a family of brothers, with one Divine Father.'" (Claims of Christianity, pages 110-111.)

Effects of the Old Order

All this will make clear just what is meant by the term "Christendom." From the words of Farrar and Lecky, it will be seen that there is absolutely no ground for the statement sometimes made, that the Reformation was an effort to bring Europe out of a degradation ignorantly attributed to the medieval order. Could such a statement in fairness be made, we may be sure that Lecky, never partial to the Church, would not have lost the opportunity to denounce the old system. Though that system itself passed with

time, it left an ineradicable mark on the history of succeeding ages. Among the causes of its passing may be mentioned the struggle between the Papacy and the Empire in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, the growth of national or quasi-national sentiment, and finally, the Great Schism of the West at the end of the fourteenth century. Some of the effects which remained after the medieval order had passed away were, like the system itself, highly beneficial. But others, which may be taken as examples of the work of the purely human element in the Church, were harmful and even disastrous, and these we must consider in their influence upon the religious revolt of the sixteenth century. Let us say that the passing of the ideal of Christendom was in itself a more or less remote cause of the Reformation insofar as it gave place (1) to an exaggerated spirit of nationalism, and (2) to the free play of elements which needed the corrective effect of a central political as well as ecclesiastical authority.

Among such abuses must be enumerated those which touched the lives of the clergy. In the old system some of the ecclesiastical electors of the Empire had become rulers of territories, and too frequently their duties as bishops were overshadowed by the role which they played as temporal princes. Again, unscrupulous sovereigns began to claim anew the right to fill vacant sees, or to exact the payment of no small tribute in return for episcopal or archiepiscopal investiture. In other words, the evils against which Gregory VII. had contended so valiantly began to reassert themselves in an acute form. Besides, simoniacal transactions were not uncommon, and thus, through the cupidity and dishonesty of princes, bishoprics were sometimes filled with unworthy men. It was therefore inevitable that the interests of religion suffered among the people. But let it be thoroughly understood that the purity of doctrine was not touched by these abuses, and that the Church herself did not connive at them at all. On the contrary, earnest efforts were made to bring about salutary reforms, and in not a few cases they were successful. Nevertheless, a large number of abuses persisted, and these we must set down as contributory to the outbreak of the so-called Reformation.

II.

Granting, then, the existence of abuses (in matters of discipline only) which called for a remedy, we can understand how these were seized upon as so many pretexts to justify the great breach with Rome. We will now review the causes which gradually led to the conditions prevalent over much of Europe at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Some of these causes have just been enumerated; here we will repeat them, and also name the others which contributed in greater or lesser degree to the debacle inaugurated by Luther. We may conveniently bring all under seven headings:

(1) The struggle of the Papacy with the Empire in the thirteenth century.

(2) The struggle of Boniface VIII. with Philip the Fair of France.

(3) The Papacy at Avignon.

(4) Clement V. and the suppression of the Templars.

(5) The Great Schism of the West.

(6) Wyclif and Hus.

(7) The Renaissance.

(1) The Struggle of the Papacy with the Empire

The beginnings of this unfortunate affair are to be looked for in the ambition of worldly-minded Emperors who aimed at the subjection of the Church to their own control. Henry IV., with whom Gregory VII was obliged to contend, is a well-known example. But Henry, with all his faults, was a man of faith; whereas Frederick II., under whom the long contest reached its climax, was as much of a free-thinker as any eighteenth-century encyclopedist. As a boy, he was the ward of Innocent III., and when his disregard of the ordinary demands of justice merited a rebuke, it was given without hesitation by that great Pontiff. To Innocent Frederick owed the purple, yet he quarrelled with his protector and waged open war on several of Innocent's successors, until finally, having driven Pope Innocent IV. out of Italy, the latter, at the First Council of Lyons, solemnly deposed him, July 17, 1245. The difficulties with Frederick had gone on for nearly thirty years, and continued in a lesser degree af-

ter the faithless Hohenstauffen Emperor was worsted. But, while Frederick was finally conquered, the long struggle had exhausted the Papacy. Indeed, Innocent IV. was so hard pressed that he had little or no time to give to the internal affairs of the Church, and, as a result certain abuses crept in, some of which were unhappily tolerated by the Pope because he thought that they gave him some advantage over the Emperor.

The net result of the struggle, then, was a decided weakening of the influence of the Holy See. Innocent had gained the victory, it is true; yet it was, in a sense, a Pyrrhic victory. If ever anyone deserved castigation, it was Frederick II. Crafty, unscrupulous, untruthful, and treacherous, he was an enemy of the public order as his age understood it, and, even if he had given them no religious grounds for grievance, the Popes were certainly justified in proceeding against him as a traitor to European society, to that "populus Christianus" threatened by the Saracens whose friend Frederick was. Yet all this notwithstanding, lesser potentates professed to see in the action of the Popes a menace to their own prerogatives, and accordingly they cultivated a spirit of so-called nationalism that was destructive, in the long run, of the ideal of Christendom. As that ideal was both political and religious, it could not be attacked politically without suffering on its religious side also, though doubtless not so much, Thus it was that the struggle with the Hohenstauffen, whilst it weakened the political prestige of the Papacy, injured to some degree its spiritual influence, and so prepared the way for subsequent religious dissension.

(2) Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair

The false spirit of nationalism of which we have just spoken was dynastic rather than popular. It was the first intimation of that theory of the Divine Right of Kings formulated after the Reformation by James I. of England. It was not a sense of nationality; it was, on the contrary, an assertion that the King can do no wrong. It was meant to free princes from their exacting spiritual overlord, and, as such, it was destructive of popular rights, because these the Popes had always protected. To this fact even Voltaire, the

arch-enemy of the Church, bears witness when he declares of a twelfth century Pontiff that, "in those times of darkness and ignorance which we distinguished by the name of the Middle Ages, no one perhaps ever deserved so well of mankind as Pope Alexander III. It was he who abolished vassalage, in a council which he held in the twelfth century. It was he who by his prudence triumphed in Venice over the brutal violence of Frederick Barbarossa, and who obliged Henry II. of England to ask pardon of God and man for the murder of Thomas a Becket. He restored the rights of the people, and chastised the wickedness of crowned heads." (Ancient and Modern History, Supplementary Notes, Vol. XXX. of Du Mont's edition, page 137.)

It is simply absurd to contend that the struggle of Papacy and Empire was a fight of the people for liberty, and yet, some historians put it just that way. There are, however, non-Catholic writers who take a sounder view. For example, we read in Bird S. Coler's "Two and Two Make Four," page 103:

"The law of nations that gave the Pope the right to protect the person and property of a crusader in the kingdom of any Christian prince whatsoever was thoroughly understood by the princes of the middle ages, and none made protest against it, although some violated it. It grew out of the necessities of the time. . . . They didn't trust their neighbors much in that freebooter age. They did trust the Pope. . . . Thus the papacy became the great court of equity of Christendom, to whom the injured turned naturally and promptly for redress. . . .

"It was by no means a light or a safe function to exercise, this of bending to justice the proud and unbridled monarchs of young Europe."

It was precisely this even-handed justice that the proud monarchs did not want. So, when the Papacy emerged triumphant but enfeebled from the long struggle with Frederick II., there was needed only a strong, irresponsible man to reopen the contest with better chances of success. Such a man was found in Philip IV. (the Fair) of France. His opponent was the aged Boniface VIII., a Pope worthy of the traditions of Hilde-

brand and Innocent III. Unfortunately, Boniface failed to understand the change that had come over Europe and was quite unprepared for Philip's vigorous opposition to the papal demand that he cease from exacting ecclesiastical revenues for the purpose of carrying on war with England. Into the details of the long quarrel we cannot, for want of space, go. Other issues arose, and finally Boniface prepared to excommunicate Philip and absolve his subjects from their oath of allegiance. The Bull **Super Petri Solio** was to have been published on September 8, 1303, but in the early morning of the preceding day Boniface's enemies, led by William de Nogaret and Sciarra Colonna, appeared before Anagni, where the Pope was then sojourning, gained access to the town, plundered the papal palace, and held Boniface a prisoner for three days. It is asserted, and with some show of reason, that the person of the Pontiff was not respected. But whether or not this be true, the fact that the minions of a Christian king would dare to treat in such a scandalous manner the Vicar of Christ is evidence enough of an altered state of affairs. Boniface was rescued by the townsmen of Anagni and taken to Rome, where the troubles through which he had passed brought on the illness which carried him to the grave a month later (October 11, 1313).

While there was a revulsion of popular feeling against Philip and his miserable creatures, it was undeniable that the Papacy could not make itself heard as Innocent III. had been heard a hundred years before. Yet the course of Philip was utterly iniquitous, and the brave old man who withstood him had justice and moral right on his side. While Boniface may have lacked prudence, he cannot with any show of fairness be reproached for tyranny. But undoubtedly Philip's disgraceful and temporary success offered some encouragement to other royal law-breakers. So here again we have a condition that operated at a distance to bring about disunion. But surely the partisans of the Reformation cannot be proud of these early events which helped ultimately to make their revolt possible.

(3) The Popes at Avignon

To Boniface succeeded Benedict XI., who reigned only half a year. Then followed Clement V., a Frenchman, whom Philip persuaded to transfer the Papal residence to Avignon in France. This move cannot but be regarded as deplorable and disastrous. For seven decades the Pontifical Court remained on the banks of the Rhone, while seven Frenchmen successively wore the tiara. All were good men, and some, like John XXII., and Urban V., are deserving of high places in the long list of Popes. Nevertheless, the "Babylonian Captivity" of the Papacy in France was a misfortune. Whilst grass grew in the streets of the Eternal City, the seat of the Supreme Pontificate, the absent Popes were regarded almost as vassals of the French King,—mere court chaplains, so to speak. It was hard for men to see in these French Popes the successors of the Gregories and Innocents and Bonifaces who never hesitated to assert themselves as the overlords of Christendom. So the prestige of the Papacy declined still more, and the enemies of the French King lost their regard for it as a great extranational tribunal. As we shall see later, the immediate effects of the Avignonese sojourn were even more disastrous to Christian unity than was the "Babylonian Captivity" itself.

It must be understood, of course, that there was a bright side to many of these dark clouds. The Papacy is not a human institution; if it were, it would have perished long ago. Holy men—and women, too, as witness St. Catherine of Siena—strove incesantly to correct the evils of the times; and the Avignonese Popes themselves made sincere efforts to free the Apostolic throne from the entanglements into which the political spirit of the age had dragged it. Ultimately these efforts were successful, but not until, unhappily, much harm had been done.

(4) The Suppression of the Knights Templar

Before leaving the Popes who reigned at Avignon, we must refer to the suppression of the Knights Templar in the time of Clement V. The opinion that this act further impaired the prestige of the Papacy cannot, we think, be gainsaid. Long before Clement's time the wealth of the

Templars had been coveted by impecunious princes, and as a result all sorts of evil reports were sedulously collected. But the final catastrophe was brought about through another action. Philip the Fair cherished a spirit of revenge against Boniface VIII. even after that valiant old Pontiff's death, and he urged Clement to try the absurd charges which he had brought against Boniface during the latter's lifetime. It is quite certain that Clement did not mean to let Philip have his way, but the king persisted in opening the case, and forthwith involved himself in difficulties from which he escaped only by creating a diversion against the Templars.

After this procedure was fairly under way, Philip did not wait for results, but usurped the Papal rights,—a step against which Clement vainly protested. The king also set on foot a campaign of slander, and the Grand Master, Jacques de Molay, with several others, declared themselves guilty of secret crimes after having been subjected to torture. Philip's course was entirely lawless. The military orders were under the immediate jurisdiction of the Pope, a fact which Philip coolly ignored; the investigation was carried on without Clement's sanction, and, finally, the royal methods were wholly corrupt. Clement annulled the trial; but the mischief had been done by the Grand Master's confession of guilt. The Holy See thereupon instituted a general investigation of the Order, the outcome of which was not unfavorable; but Clement, assailed by demands on all sides, felt obliged to decree its dissolution (Mar. 22, 1312), and turn its properties over to the Order of Hospitallers. He reserved to himself the case of the Grand Master and other high dignitaries. These had acknowledged their guilt; but at the public pronouncement of the decision Molay repudiated his confession, and declared the Order innocent of the charges against it. In other words, he stated that he had lied to save his life. This act gave Philip his chance. The Grand Master and an associate were arrested, by the king's order condemned as relapsed heretics, and burned at the stake.

Historians are divided as to the guilt of the Order. Modern investigation has favored the cause of the Templars, but much uncertainty yet

remains. But, whether the Order were guilty or not, it is impossible to urge anything in extenuation of Philip's methods. Nor did the judgment of his contemporaries spare him. Since, unhappily, Clement was obliged to intervene, he was promptly associated in the mind of his time with Philip's proceedings. In regard to his part Bishop Shahan writes: "Of Pope Clement it may be said that the few measures of equity that appear in the course of this great crime were owing to him; unfortunately, his sense of justice and his respect for the law were counterbalanced by a weak and vacillating character, to which, perhaps, his feeble and uncertain health contributed. Some think he was convinced of the Templars' guilt, especially after so many of the chief members had admitted it to himself. . . . His strongest motive was, in all probability, anxiety to save the memory of Boniface VIII. from the injustice of a formal condemnation which the malice of Nogaret and the cold vindictiveness of Philip would have insisted on, had not the rich prey of the Temple been thrown to them; to stand for both with Apostolic courage might have meant intolerable consequences, not only personal indignities, but in the end the graver evil of schism under conditions peculiarly unfavorable for the Papacy." (Catholic Encyc., vol. IV., page 22).

It will thus be seen that Clement really chose what was the lesser of two evils. Non-Catholic historians fail to take this view, because they do not, as a rule, regard schism as evil. The unfortunate result of the trial, apart from all questions, was that the Pope inevitably seemed to be a mere creature of Philip the Fair. His position made the "Babylonian Captivity" harder for his successors to bear, and lowered himself and them in the eyes of the world. In that fact we find another of the untoward circumstances that prepared the way for the Reformation.

III.

(5) The Great Schism of the West

But to a greater degree than all the untoward circumstances already mentioned, the Great Western Schism was a factor in the promotion of a growing spirit of disunion. The word "schism," by the way, is a misnomer as applied to the differences we are about to describe. This can be seen by comparing them to the Greek schism, which is properly so called. For, whereas the latter involved separation from the Roman See, and was therefore a real cutting off of the Easterns from union with the highest ecclesiastical authority, the former was merely a contention on the part of several persons, all of whom acknowledged papal supremacy, for the possession of the Roman See itself. There was no question of faith involved, except insofar as certain partisans of the several rivals were afterwards led, in the heat of the contest, to give expression to unorthodox views.

The Great Schism of the West was the result of the Papacy's long sojourn at Avignon. We have already seen that the Popes themselves chafed at the conditions which kept them there, but it was not until 1277 that Gregory XI. decided to return to Rome, which had, we are told, fallen into decay, and whose population had dwindled to less than twenty thousand. It was small wonder that the Romans welcomed the return of their long absent sovereign, but Gregory, after all, was only half persuaded to remain. However, before any decisive steps were taken, he died, March 27, 1378. The people of Rome, fearful lest the counsel would prevail that had almost persuaded Gregory to return to Avignon, demanded the election of a Roman, or, at all events, of an Italian. There were sixteen Cardinals in the Eternal City, and on April 8 they elected Bartholomew Prignano, Archbishop of Bari, to the vacant Chair of St. Peter. As threats of coercion and violence had been freely made by the Romans, thirteen of the Cardinals voted a second time by way of confirmation, as it seems, and again chose Prignano. He took the name of Urban VI., and was crowned on April 18. On the following day the

six French Cardinals who had remained in Avignon were notified of the election, and in due time their acknowledgment was received in Rome.

Two of the Cardinals present in conclave were Robert of Geneva, a Frenchman, and Pedro de Luna, a Spaniard. Both put themselves on record in their letters as accepting fully the choice of the conclave. The former was a relative of the King of France. These two men were destined later to play a large part in the so-called Schism.

Urban the Sixth

The new Pope, Urban VI., was a man of spotless character, austere, simple in his tastes, and a rigid disciplinarian. But unfortunately he was hasty, tactless, and even rude in his dealings with the Cardinals. He refused absolutely to go to Avignon, whither the hopes of his Court tended, and it may be that, as some writers state, he attacked with too much vehemence the fads and extravagances of some of its members. At all events, the Cardinals soon began to oppose him, and St. Catherine of Siena, who had been instrumental in inducing Gregory XI. to leave Avignon, now intervened to prevent a quarrel which she foresaw might lead to another long absence of the Papacy from Rome. But her efforts were not successful. In May the Cardinals left Rome, and in the following September they met at Fondi in the kingdom of Naples, and elected as Pope one of their number, Robert of Geneva, who styled himself Clement VII. Early in the following year he fled to Avignon after difficulties in Naples.

What excuse did the Cardinals offer to explain these extraordinary proceedings? Simply this, that the election of Urban VI. was invalid, because they had been subjected to the threats of a Roman mob demanding an Italian Pope, and that, consequently, they were not free agents. Now, there can be no doubt that a valid choice depended upon the freedom of the electors. The question therefore is, was the attitude of the Romans so menacing that the Cardinals in conclave were really coerced into the election of Urban against their will?

As might be expected, different historians have given different answers. But the cause of Urban has grown stronger with the passing of the cen-

turies, until now it would be decidedlv rash to dispute the genuineness of his claim. In the first place, the Cardinals took care to attest their freedom of choice by a second, and confirmatory election. Next, they all tendered him their obedience, and received favors at his hands. Furthermore, they notified the princes of Europe of their choice. It is, then, very hard to argue that they were in such terror as to be deprived of that liberty of action necessary to make them free agents. Besides, it is to be noted that they did not comply with the first demand of the Romans, which was the election of a Roman Pope. Urban was indeed an Italian; but it would seem that abject fear would have compelled them to choose someone really belonging to the Eternal City.

In passing, let us refer to a question which is sometimes asked nowadays—why are all the Popes Italians? The answer is, because of the Great Schism of the West. Not, indeed, that it has anything to do with the policv of the present time; but it certainly set the precedent, and for this reason: the Romans clamored to keep the Pope in his own city and theirs, and thus they wanted one who was an Italian. Prudence, even though there was no legitimate fear of violence, could easily justify compliance, and so it happened that Urban VI. was the first of the line of Italian Popes which has been broken but once, and that briefly, when Adrian Florenz of Utrecht reigned for some twenty months (1621-1623) as Pope Adrian VI. Other reasons in our time serve to keep up what has long become a fixed custom.

Rival Claimants

To return to our narrative. Urban was reigning at Rome, and Robert, claiming to be Pope Clement VII., was sitting in Avignon. Which of the two was the true Pope? When we remember that the question has been a mooted. one through the centuries, and has been settled with any considerable degree of certainty only within recent times, we can readily imagine the perplexity of those who were called on to pay homage to the Head of the Church. Countries were divided, as were individuals. By way of example, it may be stated that England and most of the German princes supported Urban, whilst Scot-

land and France stood out for Clement. People whom the Church has since canonized were found on different sides. St. Catherine of Siena upheld the claims of the Pope at Rome, and St. Vincent Ferrer those of his rival of Avignon. Both Urban and Clement created new Cardinals, and each did everything in his power to win and retain the allegiance of Christendom.

Intervention of the Council of Pisa

Be it remembered again that there was absolutely no dispute about the Papacy itself. All men recognized the power of the Vicar of Christ; but just then they could not determine who that Vicar was. Such a state of affairs speedily became intolerable. In 1389 Urban VI., died, and was succeeded by Boniface IX., whilst the self-styled Benedict XIII. was chosen to fill Clement's throne when the latter passed away. Several local or private councils made desperate efforts to put an end to the differences. Boniface IX. died in 1404. Innocent VII. succeeded him, and his death in turn brought Gregory XII. to the Roman throne in 1406. A council met at Pisa to adjust matters, but it assumed the right, which certainly did not belong to it, to depose both Gregory and Benedict, and to elect in their stead a Greek, Peter Philarghi, who took the name of Alexander V. As neither Gregory nor Benedict acknowledged the competence of the Pisan tribunal, there were now three claimants. Alexander at his death was succeeded by John XXIII. (Baldassare Cossa), and thus, when the Council of Constance met in 1414, it negotiated with Gregory, Benedict, and John. The first, whom we must regard in the present state of our knowledge as the real Pope, abdicated, and retired to the bishopric of Porto. The council, thoroughly suspicious of the claims of John, summarily deposed him, and finally ignored Benedict. After more than two years' discussion, the assembled Fathers on November 11, 1417 elected Odo or Otho Colonna, who took the name of Martin V. The new Pope received the obedience of all parties, and thus, after a duration of thirty-nine years, the deplorable quarrel was healed.

The Roman Line the Rightful One

As before stated, a careful sifting of the mass

of evidence points to Urban VI., Boniface IX., Innocent VII., and Gregory XII. as the true representatives of the unbroken line of St. Peter's successors. But it cannot be denied that some, at least, of the other claimants acted in good faith, and really believed themselves to be entitled to wear the triple crown. This, to give one instance, was the case with Alexander V. On the other hand, it is difficult to exonerate Benedict XIII. and John XXIII. It is interesting to note that later Popes seem to have had no difficulty in determining for themselves that Clement VII. was an intruder. When Giulio de' Medici was elected in 1523, he took the name of Clement VII., entirely ignoring Robert of Geneva's preemption, and similarly, Pietro Francesco Orsini, elevated to the Apostolic throne in 1724, styled himself Benedict XIII., notwithstanding the previous use of the same title in the Great Schism of the West. And, apart from the evidence of history, we can certainly find in the action of these later and unquestioned successors of the Fisherman no light reason for regarding Urban VI. and his line as the legitimate Popes of their troubled age.

It is hardly necessary to add that the consequences of the Great Western Schism were disastrous. To the faithful was afforded the spectacle of disunion, division, and desolation; and who can doubt that the confidence of many in the Holy See was weakened? Indeed, as stated at the outset, no one cause was more potent in bringing about that spirit of unrest which, aided later by the more turbulent spirits of the Renaissance, reaped its harvest in the troubles of the Reformation.

(6) Wyclif and Hus

But it would not be correct to infer from the above account that there was a general loss of faith, or at least a reign of lukewarmness in the hundred years which elapsed between the end of the Great Schism and the revolt of Luther. On the contrary, the testimony of parish records, diocesan registers, and the like, shows that religion was everywhere well supported, and that popular loyalty to the faith was as strong as ever. The evils of the time affected chiefly the "higher-ups," the princes and potentates, and these became,

as we shall see, the supporters of the new doctrines of the sixteenth century.

There were, however, several men who had an undeniably bad effect upon the people of their time. We shall single out two for our narrative. The first was John Wyclif, born in Egnland in 1324. Wyclif may be styled, not inaptly, the first great anti-clerical. In the early years of the reign of Edward III. England and the Holy See were at odds about questions of taxation. Besides, the English bishops were absorbed more in civil than in ecclesiastical affairs, and this led to a movement to restrict them to their own proper offices. Although its instigators were mostly laymen, it had the support of Wyclif, who was a priest.

It would be tedious to go into all the details of the quarrel that followed. Wyclif became an advisor of the government of the boy King Richard II. in the matter of the relations of England with the Holy See. However, the chief trouble was, at its root, economic. The manorial lords had reversed the system in vogue of exchanging the labor obligations of their dependents for money payments, and this, apparently, to protect themselves against a rapidly rising scale of wages. But the peasantry, determined to hold the lords to their old agreement, objected strenuously to any change, and in this they were supported by Wyclif and other priests, who attacked the monasteries as well as the lords on the ground that they held too much property. In 1381 a revolt broke out; but the young King Richard rode straight into the camp of the rebels, obtained their allegiance, and finally sent them to their homes. Other bands were unsuccessful, and to all intents the revolt was soon put down. But Parliament refused to approve Richard's promises to the rebels, and proceeded instead to investigate the King's own financial affairs. Afterwards, however, all persons affected were pardoned at the time of the royal wedding in 1382. Notwithstanding the apparent failure of the peasants' movement, it really marked the beginning of the end of serfdom in England, and hence it is a conspicuous landmark in the field of economic history.

Its effect on Wyclif was unfortunate. In his

defense of the rebels he had been led to assert that sin nullifies the right of a man to property, that all goods should be held in common, and that the Church had no just title to landed possessions. His followers put these theories into practice by attacking, wherever they could, monastic lands and buildings. After the beginning of the Great Western Schism, Wyclif's entire religious belief seems to have undergone a change. He attacked successively the doctrine of papal supremacy, that of indulgences, the rights of the episcopate, etc., and then began to reject the sacraments. In 1382 Peter de Courtenay, Archbishop of Canterbury, called a council at which, among other things, Wyclif's denial of the doctrine of Transubstantiation was condemned. The University of Oxford, where Wyclif was active, was called upon to desist from heretical teaching. But, though it professed to repudiate the rebel's doctrines, it refused to comply with the Archbishop's demand. Thereupon the government intervened, and the University submitted. No action was taken against Wyclif himself, and two years later he died.

Wyclif was the first professed English heretic. He undoubtedly took advantage of the Great Schism to propagate his doctrines, and he left a party, called the Lollards, to carry on what he had begun. At the beginning of the reign of Henry V. severe measures were proposed against the Lollards, but it was not until 1414, when they conspired to seize the King, that they were suppressed with any decided show of force. The party gradually disbanded, and but little of its influence was abroad in the time of Luther. Still, it was at least an historical memory, and it had certainly broken down for the time the religious belief of a not inconsiderable number of people. It may therefore be reckoned a factor, albeit a minor one, in the creation of a feeling prejudicial to Catholic unity.

Hus

But, if the career of Wyclif had relatively little effect on the old religion of England, that of his chief imitator on the Continent was much more troublesome. John Hus was born in Bohemia in 1369. Ordained priest in 1400, he was appointed rector of the University of Prague in

1402. The Bohemians, or Czechs, are a Slavonic people isolated by the surrounding German territories, and even in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries their national problem was an acute one. The Czech language was slowly giving way to the German, and Hus had become a champion of the national cause. At the same time he took up the teachings of Wyclif, and circulated the latter's writings, seemingly by toleration of King Wenceslaus and Archbishop Zbynek of Prague. The latter, however, was ordered by Pope Innocent VII. to check the propaganda, and his successor, Gregory XII., took similar cognizance of the king's attitude. These efforts were for the time successful; but the whole issue was complicated by the racial trouble and by the rivalry of the several claimants to the Papacy. None of the last, indeed, failed to strike at the heresy; but the indecision of Christendom as to whom the tiara really belonged, naturally weakened the effect of their words.

The national question soon brought the king into oppostion with Gregory XII. The bishops and clergy were forbidden to write to that Pontiff, and, when some of them disobeyed the royal mandate, they were summarily deposed. The Archbishop then placed Prague under interdict, and sent word of the proceedings to Rome. In answer the Pisan Pope, Alexander V., ordered him to check the circulation of Wyclif's writings. The Archbishop showed no lack of energy in carrying out Alexander's mandate, but Hus refused to obey, and appealed instead to John XXIII. He was therefore excommunicated by Zbynek in July, 1410,—a sentence ratified in the following year. Nevertheless, Hus, relying on the king's support, persisted in his defence of Wyclif, and, with the help of Jerome of Prague, incited the populace to acts of violence against the envoys of John XXIII. Zbynek, fearful of the king's attitude, sought asylum with Sigismund of Hungary, but died on his way to that sovereign's court.

Hus, threatened with imprisonment, also left Prague, but returned in 1414 and resumed his campaign. This was on the very eve, so to speak, of the assemblage of the Council of Constance, and, after it opened its sessions, Sigismund of

Hungary, essaying the role of peacemaker, persuaded Hus to appear before the Council to defend his teachings. The trial which followed resulted in his condemnation, and he went to his death on July 6, 1415. Eleven months afterward his associate, Jerome of Prague, suffered the same fate. Hus will doubtless be regarded, in the coming Luther celebrations, as one of the great heroes of anti-papal revolt.

It is difficult to understand the motives or fathom the character of this strange man. He seems to have regarded his doctrines as entirely orthodox, although he could not possibly have justified them. His agitation survived in a school of followers, the chief of whose errors was the doctrine that the Holy Eucharist could be validly received by clergy and laity alike only under both species. But they held other doctrinal innovations as well, and became a political as well as a religious party. Anarchy and bloodshed followed their agitation. There can be no doubt that religious unity in Bohemia and the neighboring territories was terribly undermined by the Hussites. Hence we must regard them as one of the predisposing elements that led to the Reformation.

IV.

(7) The Renaissance

There is no historical epoch more difficult to evaluate properly than that of the Renaissance; and this because the movement was so far-reaching, so complex, that an attempt to estimate its achievements by any one of its so-called results, is certain to end in failure. Even its duration is not a fixed quantity. In its widest sense it may be said to extend from the Great Schism of the West to the French Revolution, a period of five centuries; but it is more easily confined to the time between the fall of Constantinople (1453) and the sack of Rome (1527). And it is within these limits that we shall discuss it, for, whilst its spirit lived onward through Reformation times, the aspects of the latter are entirely distinct from it in many very important particulars.

The Renaissance has had a legion of apologists. The farther their sympathies from the traditional Christian Church, the more likely were they to find in it the **summum bonum** of humanity. Thus, Symonds glorifies the movement as "a new birth to liberty—the spirit of mankind recovering consciousness and the power of self-determination, recognizing the beauty of the outer world and of the body through art, liberating the reason in science and the conscience in religion, and establishing the principles of political freedom" (The Renaissance in Italy, p. 30). All this sounds like one of those cheap eulogies of the Reformation to which we have long been accustomed. The words "liberty" and "freedom" are used by Symonds without much, if any, reference to their real meaning, as we shall presently see.

As for the intellectual awakening so often said to belong to the Renaissance, its origin should be sought some two or three centuries before the Turks breached the thousand-year-old walls of Constantinople. On this point Lecky's judgment is sound. "The more carefully," he writes, "the history of the centuries prior to the Reformation is studied, the more evident it becomes that the twelfth century forms the great turning point of the European intellect. Owing to many complicated causes, which it would be tedious and diffi-

cult to trace, a general revival of Latin literature had then taken place which profoundly modified the intellectual condition of Europe." (History of Rationalism, vol. I., p. 70). No one wishes to refuse credit to the intellectual activities of the Renaissance period; but it is absurd to regard all of them as unmixed blessings. In fact, we can understand the effects of the Renaissance only by drawing a sharp line of demarcation between its good and its bad sides. And we can estimate its share in the subsequent Reformation only by weighing carefully the relative effects of its good influences and its bad.

Effects of the Fall of Christendom

We have already seen that the medieval ideal of Christendom had broken down before the close of the fourteenth century. For its undeniable blessings to civilization was substituted that tyranny of princes which was but a recrudescence of old pagan theories of government. The people were oppressed, and then, deprived of their former means of redress through the Pontifical court, they resorted to reprisals which in their nature were pagan, too. In time the several strata of society were paganized, and then the age began to seek pagan ideals in art, literature, music, etc. Nothing was more easy than to turn for inspiration to classic antiquity, and hence grew up the school of the Humanists, men who professed to lead the revolt against the scholastic theology and philosophy, and to set up in their stead a rule of life based upon worldly desires,—a rule which could be best expressed by the "carpe diem" of the old Epicureans. It has been well said that the austerity of St. John the Baptist gave place in the new order to the orgies of Bacchus; the virtues of purity, humility, and meekness were thrown aside for the pagan vices of luxury and pride. The sympathetic Symonds has summed up his views in these words: "The essence of Humanism consisted in a new and vital perception of the dignity of man as a rational being, apart from theological determinations, and in the further perception that classical literature alone displayed human nature in the plentitude of moral and intellectual freedom." (Revival of Learning, p. 71). Symonds was a serious student, but he failed utterly to understand the humanistic spirit.

To any one who knows the moral degradation of many of the ancient classics, the very words of Symonds himself show that Humanism, at least in Italy, was nothing else than a movement away from Christian morality and the whole Christian philosophy of life.

The Real Evils

Now it is just in this fact that the real evils of the Renaissance must be sought. They are not to be found in the mere revival of classic studies, nor in the quest of the beautiful, nor in the awakening scientific speculation of the age, but rather in the attempt to press all these things into the service of a revived and refurbished paganism. Symonds himself, apologist for Humanism as he is, bears witness to the moral degradation that followed in the wake of its progress. And who can doubt that such conditions inevitably induced a degree of religious doubt which facilitated, if it did not cause, the oncoming evils of the Reformation? The saints, the Blessed Virgin, and even Our Lord Himself were often spoken of or depicted under pagan symbols,—a fact which shows at once the true inwardness of the humanistic philosophy.

But here a caveat must be entered. It will not do to convey the impression that every Humanist was a moral monster or a cynical sceptic. There were many very good men associated with the movement on its purely literary and artistic side; men who either repelled entirely the pagan speculations of their fellows, or ignored them as something extraneous to the movement itself. Among these was Blessed Thomas More in England, a martyr in the time of Henry VIII. to his belief in the Papal supremacy. Another was Erasmus, albeit many counts remain against him because of the unconcealed irony of his writings. Popes Nicholas V. and Pius II. may be taken as examples of the earlier type of Italian Humanists. We shall later examine separately the attitude of each Pope of the period towards the humanistic movement.

Nevertheless, after making all due allowances for the many great and upright names closely associated with Humanism, the fact remains that both faith and morals, under its influence, declined appalingly. As Mgr. Baudrillart points out,

Petarch "deplored that to make an open profession of the Christian faith, and to show that one held it higher than pagan philosophy, was to gain a reputation for folly and ignorance." One of the leading Humanists of his time, Pomponius Laetus, an enemy of Pope Paul II., averred that knowledge and faith, or science and faith, if you will, were incompatible one with the other.

Renaissance Historians

It does not require much investigation to learn that truth was not held in high regard by the paganized Humanists. As an example may be cited Platina, in whose Lives of the Popes we find the germ of the ridiculous story, afterwards enlarged and embellished, to the effect that Pope Calixtus III. excommunicated Halley's Comet on its appearance in 1456. Platina was a friend of the Pomponius Laetus just mentioned, and like him, held the post of Abbreviator at the Pontifical court. The treasonable acts of these men caused Paul II. to dismiss them, and imprison Platina himself. By way of revenge, Platina in his "Lives" attacks the character of Paul savagely. How much his statements are worth may be seen from the comments of Dr. William Benham, an Anglican clergyman, who translated the "Vitae Pontificum" into English a quarter of a century ago. Dr. Benham says that Platina, in his biography of Paul, "pays off many old scores of vengeance. Paul II., however, had been dead some years, and the only harm caused by his biased judgment was that subsequent generations have formed erroneous ideas of Paul's real character." (Vol. I., p. xi.) But Paul was not the only Pontiff to suffer at Platina's hands. Among others may be mentioned the great medieval scholar, Sylvester II. And let it be said in passing that Platina's notorious disregard for truth should serve as a warning to those who eagerly devour all the hostile statements made about the Popes of the Renaissance period by their political enemies. It is noteworthy that those very Pontiffs who made the most strenuous efforts to stem the tide of corruption are the ones whom historians have held up as obscurantists and "medievalists."

Italy was not the only country touched by the Renaissance. Its effect in the others, how-

ever, was quite different. In Germany, for example, its influence indeed served to weaken the position of the Church; but not exactly in favor of pagan ideals. There the movement tended rather towards a somewhat vague rationalism which developed an over-critical spirit without open repudiation of Christian philosophy. In France the age of the Renaissance and that of the Reformation were both times of much internal political agitation, whilst in England it is hard to discern any decided influence of Humanism upon the life of the nation at large. These facts will be developed when dealing with the Reformation itself. Whilst the writer is not contending that the Reformation was a direct effect of the Renaissance, he thinks it at least interesting to note that Italy, (which was the first country to feel the impulse of that counter-reform of the later sixteenth century which tells so eloquently of the ever-exuberant vitality of the Church), shook off some of the worst features of the Renaissance movement, and so suffered no religious change, whilst Germany was affected to just the degree we should expect from her tendency towards rationalism; though it must not be forgotten that the Reformation, wherever successful, was abetted to a greater or less degree by the unsavory politics of the age.

Effect of the Fall of Constantinople

It is often said that the fall of Constantinople, in 1453, gave an enormous impetus to the Renaissance by scattering throughout Western Europe vast quantities of Greek books and manuscripts. The Byzantine scholars, too, were obliged to fly from Moslem tyranny, and seek homes in Italy and other western lands. Such men as Cardinal Bessarion, who had been a staunch upholder of the religious union of East with West, undoubtedly did much for the better side of the Renaissance; but it is to be feared that, on the whole, the cause of religion gained little from the influx of Greek scholars to Italy. In the first place, the schismatic Church of Constantinople, despite its unending arguments against the Latins, and despite, too, the activities of the pro-Roman party in it, was moribund long before the fatal attack of Mohammed II. on the old capital of

the Roman Empire. Pears declares that in Constantinople, before the final siege, "there was no fervor of belief. The missionary spirit was absolutely extinct. . . . The great body of idle monks contrast unfavorably with those of the West of the same period. . . . A dead level of contented mediocrity characterized the clergy. An enthusiasm for Christianity, if it could not have saved the empire, might at least have prolonged its existence. But enthusiasm was dead," (Fall of the Greek Empire, page 183). Whatever, then, the effects of the dispersion of Greek scholars may have been,—and the writer is inclined to think those effects exaggerated,—it is certain that no religious fervor animated the majority of the Byzantine fugitives, and hence it is not surprising that they fell in all too readily with the corrupt manners of their new Western friends. At all events, the neo-pagan movement had been on foot in Italy long before 1453.

We conclude, then, that the results of the Humanist movement were disastrous to Christian morals, and in a lesser degree to Christian faith. The next point to be considered is the attitude of the Supreme Pontiffs towards Humanism in its several aspects, — religious, intellectual, and artistic.

V.

Martin V. and Eugene IV.

The Renaissance movement was well under way when the Great Schism of the West came to an end. But the task of restoring matters to their normal state left the new Pope, Martin V. (1417-1431), little time to concern himself with affairs of literature and art. Yet the Council of Constance undoubtedly promoted the cause of Humanism by the presence, at its sessions, of many Italian scholars. These men, Pastor tells us, beguiled the long weeks by going from one monastery to another in quest of manuscripts, and made many notable discoveries. (Lives of the Popes, vol. I., p. 257).

Martin's successor, Eugene IV. (1431-1447), had a stormy and eventful pontificate. A certain want of prudence in dealing with men brought him into conflict with the Council of Basle, summoned just before the death of Martin V., and his enemies took advantage of the strained relations of Pope and Council to incite a rebellion against him in Rome itself. Eugene and his court therefore withdrew to Florence. Now it is evident that a Pontiff placed in such circumstances could not, even if he wished, take a large or direct part in the Renaissance. But, indirectly, the sojourn of the Papal Court at Florence, then the literary and artistic capital of Europe, gave a decided impetus to the movement. Humanists of the earlier and better kind were appointed to secretaryships, or obtained the cardinal's hat, and not only was the collection of libraries encouraged, but the foundations of the science of archaeology were laid at that time.

Nicholas V.

Among Eugene's Humanist cardinals was Thomas Parentucelli, who succeeded him as Pope Nicholas V. (1447-1455). Nicholas was a liberal patron of arts and letters. He was widely known as a scholar, his quest of books and manuscripts was untiring, and he had always been a man of blameless life. His reign was largely occupied by the problem of rescuing Constantinople, then menaced by the Turks, and especially,

after 1451, by the terrible Mohammed II. He spared no pains to send aid to the Roman Empire of the East in its death-struggle with the barbarians of Asia, and the fall of the imperial city, in 1453, may fairly be said to have hastened his death. His biographer, Manetti, represents him as declaring at the end of life that he wished Rome, the centre of religion, to become as well the centre of literature, science, and art. And, indeed, he had done much to realize this hope. His patronage of education was especially noteworthy. English-speaking peoples will remember that he founded, in 1449, the University of Glasgow. Macaulay, in his "Inaugural Speech at Glasgow College," did not hesitate to call Nicholas "the greatest of the restorers of learning."

Nicholas therefore deserves well of his fellowmen on many counts. Yet Humanism, in his time, was drawing near to its turning-point, and it must be admitted that he favored too indiscriminately the leading Humanists of his day. It is quite true that Nicholas' predecessors had tolerated a few bad characters among them. Thus a certain Poggio was appointed to a secretaryship by Boniface IX., at the very beginning of the fifteenth century, and in spite of his notoriously scandalous proceedings he succeeded in holding it through eight pontificates. Nevertheless, it is true that Humanism, in the first half of the fifteenth century, had relatively little of the pagan degradation which characterized it in the second half.

The Art of Printing

Before taking our leave of the reign of Nicholas V., let us call attention to an important factor in the growth of the anti-Christian phase of Humanism. This was the invention of movable types for printing, the credit for which is now generally given to John Gutenberg of Mayence. Another inhabitant of the same old town, Peter Schoeffer, was the first to discard the laborious method of cutting types by hand for the much more expeditious process of casting.

Now if no other evidence were at hand to show that the clergy had kept alive the spirit of religion in spite of humanistic paganism and daring speculation, the number of bibles and works of piety printed before the Reformation would

supply quite enough. Probably the oldest complete printed book in existence is the so-called "Mazarin Bible," which dates from 1450-1455, and of which several copies exist. (A beautiful colorplate of a page from this Bible will be found in the Catholic Encyclopedia, volume V., facing page 292.) Within half a century after Gutenberg's invention every considerable town in Europe had a printing-press, and Rome itself, in 1475, possessed no fewer than twenty.

But the press was (as indeed it is still) a power for evil as well as for good. Through it the Humanists silently and successfully spread their doctrines. They were thus able to escape the attention of the authority which would have been drawn to them by lectures. It must not be forgotten that no small part of their work was the effort to break down respect for authority, and this they did by jibes, lampoons, and innuendoes. In fact, one of the most obvious points of resemblance in Renaissance and Reformation is the rejection of the principle of authority and exaltation of private judgment by both, and here, at least, we can understand that the second movement took its cue from the first. The injury to religion was increased by the low moral tone and free-and-easy scepticism which too often pervaded the Humanists' works. The propaganda went on swiftly and secretly. To the press is due, then, not a little of the change that came over Humanism, outwardly at all events, not long after the middle of the fifteenth century.

Papal Nepotism

Before continuing, we will here call attention to another bad influence. Several of the Popes conferred benefices on undeserving relatives, or entrusted them with offices of importance. Apart from the obvious danger of such a course, there was the further one of bringing into the concerns of the Papacy the quarrels of noble families, and it was not to be thought that unworthy scions of these would be too scrupulous in the means they used to advance their own interests. As events proved, papal nepotism was a very large element in bringing on the disasters of the age. That the responsible Pontiffs always realized the dangerous possibilities may well be

doubted; but those possibilities existed, and many unfortunately became realities.

The Second Era of the Renaissance

With Nicholas V. we leave, as Baudrillart has pointed out, the first era of the Renaissance. We now take up its second, and more important, period.

Calixtus III. and Pius II.

Nicholas was succeeded by an aged Spanish Cardinal, Alfonso de Borja (Borgia), who reigned as Pope Calixtus III. from 1455 to 1458. His pontificate was spent in trying to rouse Europe to a sense of its danger from the victorious Turks. He had little love for the Humanists, and they had none for him. His was an upright, virtuous character, but unhappily it was not free from the reproach of nepotism. To him succeeded the Humanist Aneas Sylvius Piccolomini, a voluminous writer and a mathematician of note. As Pius II. he reigned from 1458 to 1464. In his earlier days, and before taking Holy Orders, books of decidedly bad character had come from his pen. (These he formally condemned as Pope.) Then, too, he had been an adversary of Pope Eugene IV. in the latter's troubles with the Council of Basle. The Humanists, notwithstanding his change of life when he became an ecclesiastic, evidently expected much of Pius, but they were bitterly disappointed. Like Calixtus, the new Pope devoted his energies largely to a proposed crusade against the Turks. However, he found time to ferret out all writers of bad morals, and favored only those who kept to the teachings of the Church. As one who had been in his earlier days among the evil spirits of the Renaissance, he knew its bad side thoroughly, and it is to his everlasting credit that this "converted Humanist' struggled against it as he did. Without any hesitation he banned his own humanistic writings. "Reject Aeneas; hold fast to Pius."

Paul II.

After Pius came Paul II. (Peter Barbo), whose pontificate (1464-1471) lacked just one month of seven years' duration. He was not opposed to the literary spirit as such; indeed, he formed a large collection of books himself, and promoted,

besides, improvements in the art of printing. It seems certain that he owed his election, in part at least, to dissatisfaction with the proceedings of Pius II. Yet he, too, terribly disappointed the Humanists. Realizing that the Renaissance was now thoroughly paganized, he prepared to take drastic measures against its undeniably bad influences. In particular, he undertook to reform the College of Abbreviators,—men whose chief duty consisted in drawing up bulls and other documents. This College had become a hot-bed of Humanism, even under Pius II., and Paul dealt with it by suppressing many of its offices. This led to downright treason on the part of those affected, and, as we have already seen, they obtained revenge in the history written by Platina, one of their number, who did not hesitate to paint an utterly false picture of Paul's character. They also formed a so-called "Roman Academy," of which the rascally Pomponius Laetus was "Pontifex Maximus." But Paul prosecuted them vigorously, and succeeded in restoring a semblance of order. Nevertheless, the embers of Humaism were not extinguished, and soon blazed up again.

So far, the Popes on the whole acquitted themselves well in dealing with the unworthy side of the Renaissance. Here and there, perhaps, their concessions were a little too broad. They did not always judge men adequately, nor was their perception of possibilities always clear. But their mistakes, after all, were minor ones; their intentions were undoubtedly praiseworthy.

Sixtus IV.

With Sixtus IV., (Francesco della Rovere: 1471-1484), another type of man sat upon the Chair of St. Peter. Though he strove to organize a crusade, and succeeded, besides, in correcting sundry abuses, Sixtus was the slave of nepotism in its worst form. He made his unworthy nephew, Rafaelle Riario, a cardinal, and the latter, in 1478, organized the so-called Conspiracy of the Pazzi, planned to overthrow the Medici and place Florence under the rule of the Riarii. Giuliano de' Medici was murdered, and Florence dealt energetically with the assassins and other conspirators. Sixtus, who knew noth-

ing of this part of the plot, actually laid Florence under interdict because of its rebellion against the scoundrels. War followed, and Sixtus was entrapped in other political meshes by a second unworthy nephew. Personally, he was a man of blameless character, but, as was to have been expected, he was much maligned by his enemies. His reign was unfortunate. Whatever good he accomplished—and it was by no means inconsiderable—was overshadowed by his political blunders, which brought to the fore the secular side of the Papacy, and kept it there for several decades. Then, too, he undid the anti-humanistic work of Paul II. by re-opening the Roman Academy. It was at his behest that Platina wrote the Lives of the Popes already mentioned.

The Later Renaissance Pontiffs

Here, then, we find the development of a real evil in the relations of the Holy See with Humanism. The evil grew under Sixtus' two successors, Innocent VIII. (1484-1492), and Alexander VI. (1492-1503), although both were rather indifferent towards the Humanists as such. Pius III., who followed Alexander in 1503, set his heart on reform, but he died after a pontificate of only twenty-seven days. Then came the famous Julius II. (Giuliano della Rovere: 1503-1513), warrior and statesman. Though irascible by nature, and by no means free from faults, he was a man of magnificent prospects with a soul "of royal mold." He did not always edify Europe, yet he never acted without what seemed to him a good reason.

Julius was a thoroughgoing child of the Renaissance, though he had little sympathy with Humanism in most of its aspects. As a patron of art he was lavish, munificent, prodigal. His grandest project was the rebuilding of St. Peter's Church, which had then been standing for nearly twelve hundred years. The plans were prepared, the old basilica hastily demolished, and work on its successor begun. As we shall see, the indulgences offered by Leo X. in connection with the erection of the new St. Peter's afterward furnished Luther with a pretext to attack the Church and its head at a time favorable to religious dissension.

Summary

We have now followed the course of the Renaissance in Italy, and have measured its influences as bearing upon the subsequent Reformation. It will be admitted without cavil that these influences were all too strong. They were transplanted into other countries, and took root, bearing fruit not exactly like that of the Italian Renaissance, indeed, but essentially the same in one very important respect—the rejection of the principle of authority. Our next duty is to give a brief account of Humanism in Germany, and then proceed to Luther himself.

VI.

German Humanism: Reuchlin

German humanism just before the Reformation centers about two names,—those of Johann Reuchlin and Desiderius Erasmus. The former was born in Baden February 22, 1455. As a student, he was something of a cosmopolitan. He sought learning at Paris, Basle, Orleans, and Poitiers, as well as in his native land, and was no stranger at Florence. He introduced or revived the study of Hebrew in Germany. Two of his works, "De Verbo Mirifico" and "De Arte Cabbalistica," seem decidedly childish now. In them he discourses on mysterious figures and obscure names. His rank as a scholar, and especially as a student of Hebrew, was deservedly high. He was a jurist, philosopher, historian, and expert in classical languages.

But the most important event of his career was his dispute with Johann Pfefferkorn, a converted Jew. This man had denounced the Talmud, declaring it to be a deliberate affront to Christianity, and had further induced the Emperor to issue a decree forbidding the circulation of Hebrew works. Unfortunately, Reuchlin was requested to give his opinion of this course, and in reply expressed entire disapproval. Pfefferkorn, angered at Reuchlin's attitude, attacked the latter in his "Handspiegel." Reuchlin answered at length, and the dispute was then referred for settlement to Cologne. Reuchlin's contentions were not sustained, and he forthwith appealed to Rome. The matter now passed into the hands of the Bishop of Speyer, who reversed the findings of the Cologne theologians. This caused their leader, Hochstraten, in his turn to appeal to Rome; but Leo X., unwilling to hear the case in its very heat, so to speak, postponed action indefinitely.

It may appear, on first sight, that this dispute was a trivial matter. Many of greater moment had been argued with more determination, and had issued in no particularly serious results. But the quarrel under discussion caused writers innumerable to line up on one side or the other,

and a veritable deluge of abuse and ill-feeling was the consequence. The followers of Reuchlin satirized their Cologne opponents, and, in the "Letters of the Obscurantists"—the name they had given to the Cologne theologians—their antagonists were made to describe what purported to be their own vices and ignorance. Whilst this quarrel was in progress, Luther made his break from the Church. His proceedings finally aroused Leo X. to action; but not until 1520 were steps taken to silence Reuchlin.

The damage, however, had then been done. Many of Reuchlin's followers definitely placed themselves on the side of the Lutheran movement, though Reuchlin himself remained a Catholic to the end. It is impossible to acquit him of the charge of having caused great harm to the Church in Germany; yet it is equally impossible to maintain that he foresaw all the consequences of his actions. However, once the chief heresiarch had repudiated the teachings of the Church, Reuchlin endeavored to draw his followers away. Among the latter was his grandnephew, the famous Melancthon. Reuchlin did not live to see the catastrophic effects of the so-called Reformation. He died June 30, 1522, in his sixty-eighth year.

Erasmus

Desiderius Erasmus, another great light of northern Humanism, was born at Rotterdam in the Netherlands in 1467. His was a many-sided character. His scholarship was remarkable for versatility rather than profundity; indeed, even such an admirer as Mr. William S. Lilly admits that "he was not a profound thinker," for "it was not an age of profound thought." He goes on to say, however, that Erasmus "was an eminently sane thinker." One is at a loss to know just what could have suggested such a judgment to the mind of a Catholic scholar of Mr. Lilly's standing. If we take, for example, Erasmus' "Colloquia Familiaria," published at the time of Luther's first troubles with Rome, we shall find it truly representative of the shallow side of the Renaissance. It holds up to ridicule the shortcomings of priests and monks, and is not only vulgar, but positively indecent in parts of its

narrative. Now no "sane thinker" at such a time would have chosen a course which was certain to help Luther in his assaults on Catholic teaching. Furthermore, Erasmus' "Paraphrases of the New Testament" exhibits a spirit which would do fair credit to a disciple of the twentieth-century school of the Higher Criticism. We do not know whether to give first place to his biting sarcasm, or to his cold and repulsive scepticism. He expressed doubts like any encyclopedic rationalist of pre-Revolutionary France, and he showed scant respect for the disciplinary and devotional ordinances of the Church.

Yet, for all his hostility of expression, Erasmus never repudiated belief in unity with the Bishop of Rome as the visible head of the Church of Christ. How far his course was dominated by conviction has long been a disputed point. If, however, we accept Mr. Lilly's dictum that he was not a profound thinker, we may, perhaps, be justified in holding the view that his dangerous utterances were inspired rather by his humanistic sympathies than by genuine conviction that affairs ecclesiastical had gone hopelessly awry. Of course, he could not be blind to the abuses about him. He differed from Luther in that he appealed to the literary class of his time, whereas Luther throughout his career sought first the unreasoning approval of the mob. It was quite consistent, then, with Erasmus' views that he tried to bring about a reform which would not touch the hierarchical constitution of the Church. He was not by nature a compromiser, yet seemingly he saw little hope of checking Luther unless by some measure of peaceable concession.

Erasmus Remains a Catholic

But once Luther had cast off his allegiance to the Church, Erasmus was compelled to abandon all idea of compromise. He saw plainly that no reform could be wrought by rebellion, and he thus was forced by the logic of circumstances either to repudiate the primacy of the Roman See, or to abandon hope in Luther's good intentions. It is to his credit that he remained in communion with the old Church, although he always opposed efforts to bring Luther back to obedience by coercion. Hence he condemned the Bull of ex-

communication issued against Luther, and took the latter's part on several other occasions. Erasmus' air of vacillation caused the papal legate, Aleander, to look on him askance, and to report to Rome that the poison of his teaching had a much more dangerous effect than that of Luther, since the latter, by the violence of his writings, had injured his own cause.

Nevertheless, in letters to Pope Adrian VI., his own countryman, Erasmus asserted over and over again his fidelity to Rome. Adrian himself, and Henry VIII. of England also, urged him to use his pen against Luther, and with these requests he complied. Nor did his writings lack judgment and skill. He first essayed to demolish Luther's arguments against free-will, and his "Diatribe de'Libero Arbitrio," published in 1524, may be said to have determined at least one important issue, since Luther replied with a counter-argument bearing the title, "De Servo Arbitrio." Here, then, was a clear line of cleavage between the old belief and the new. From Basle, where Erasmus now resided, the literary battle went on; but the progress of the Reformation about him drove the controversialist to Freiburg in 1529. He lived six years longer, and, when his life was nearing its end, Pope Paul III. offered him the Cardinal's hat, "a fitting, however tardy recognition," says Mr. Lilly, "of his services in vindicating the unity of the Catholic Church, and the prerogatives of the Pope as the instrument of that unity." (Claims of Christianity, p. 188).

Estimate of Erasmus

What are we to think of this strange character? Is it any wonder that different men have taken widely different views of his honesty, and, above all, of the sincerity of his religious convictions? In the first place, we may say that many of his admirers have decidedly over-rated him in some respects. Although a man of vast learning, he was not exactly the intellectual prodigy that they have pictured. He had a remarkable memory and a quick, though not powerful, mind. But he was not especially fitted to cope with the religious troubles of his time. While, therefore, he deserves applause for his defense of the Church after Luther's definitive break, we think that it is going a little too far to represent him

as one of the most powerful factors in checking the progress of the Reformation in Germany. That he was such a factor no one will gainsay: yet neither will anyone deny that he was also a factor in spreading the flame of religious revolt. Who shall attempt to weigh the merits of his defense of the Church against the demerits of his earlier attacks on her institutions and discipline? His "Paraphrases of the New Ttestament" unquestionably fell in line with the theory of private judgment which became one of the shibboleths of the Reformation. Whilst, therefore, we cannot help but hold him in great blame, yet we again remember his services in the last decade of his life. In other words, it is impossible to fix the weight and the extent of his responsibility in preparing the way for Luther, yet responsible to a not inconsiderable extent he certainly was.

Erasmus may be taken as a fair representative of the intellectual turmoil of his age. In a recent paper in the Irish Ecclesiastical Record (August, 1916, p. 140), Rev. T. O'Herlihy, C. M., aptly styles him "the **enfant terrible** of the Renaissance." We find mirrored in his character and writings both its vices and its good qualities. His career shows something of the frivolity which marked the later days of Humanism, yet he was not a paganizer as were his Italian brethren. Germany had more profound scholars than he, as witness Nicholas of Cusa, Bishop of Brixen and Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church. There were men who typified more thoroughly the awakening impulse to pry into the secrets of Nature, and bring to light discoveries which were the first links in the marvelous chain of scientific development often and wrongfully attributed to the Reformation. Among these men were Koenigsberg, usually called Regiomontanus, and George Purbach, the astronomers, and a greater in the same noble study than they,—Nicholas Copernicus, "the Columbus of the skies." It was in that age that the Genoese sailor braved the stormy Atlantic, to plant the Cross of Christ and the standards of the Spanish monarchs on what he believed to be the soil of the far-off Indies. These men were all typical of the better side of the Renaissance; Erasmus brings to play on his

life some of its more lurid lights. Yet, as Father O'Herlihy says, his religious convictions were deeper than it has generally been surmised. Indeed, the fact that he enjoyed the good-will of all the Popes of the Reformation period goes far to lift from him the suspicion of holding his faith lightly.

And in this connection it must not be forgotten that there were other spirits among the German Humanists who contributed in considerable degree to the religious disorders of their age. One in particular, Ulrich von Hutten, who died a year after Reuchlin, showed nothing of Erasmus' loyalty to the old Church. He openly joined in Luther's revolt; but that step practically sealed the fate of German Humanism. It was unable to survive the divergent religious tenets of its chief protagonists.

And now to sum up. We have seen the humanistic movement begin a century or more before it succumbed to paganism. The immortal Dante was its forerunner; Petrarch was one of its early lights. The downward tendency first manifested itself, to any considerable degree, during the Great Schism of the West. After the Schism was healed, it invaded the Roman Court itself, and finally for a time secularized that court. It cast a baneful shadow over the art and letters of the second half of the fifteenth century. Using satire as its weapon, it held up to scorn certain ecclesiastical laxities of the age; and, carrying its attacks too far, it broke down the traditional respect for authority. It thus paved the way for the assertion of the so-called right of private judgment. It was the dominating spirit of the Renaissance; and, whilst it cannot be said, except in a very broad sense, that the Reformation was a direct result of the Renaissance, it is unquestionably true that the anti-Christian aspects of Humanism did much to insure the success of the sixteenth century upheaval.

VII.

We have now surveyed all of the great and some of the lesser historic movements which contributed directly or even indirectly to the Reformation. Obviously, the next step is to deal with the work of Luther himself. But, before doing so, a brief review of what has already been said, and an indication of the method which we intend to pursue, will not be out of place.

The Nature of the Church

First, let us understand well what the Church is. Catholics believe her to be the divinely appointed guardian of faith and morals, commissioned by her Founder to teach His doctrine to men until the end of time. To one of Christ's Apostles was given the primacy not only of honor but of jurisdiction; and, since this Apostle was not to live in this world as long as the Church would endure, common-sense, even if there were no definite statements of Our Lord to such effect, would teach that the government of the Church at St. Peter's death would pass to another, who would also be the heir of the powers promised to his predecessor. And thus these powers would be handed down in the Church, their exercise in respect of faith and morals always guarded by the presence of the Holy Spirit who came on the first Pentecost Sunday to abide with the Church forever. As the centuries passed, the realization of all that this implied necessarily grew stronger. The primacy itself, from the beginning, became bound up historically with the Roman bishopric, and it is in the occupants of that see, therefore, that we look for the visible heads of the Church Universal, since there St. Peter finally established himself—a fact which is now admitted by all scholarly non-Catholic historians.

Now, since the Church is made up of human beings, and their profession of the true faith does not mean that they forthwith become saints, it follows that members of the Church are by no means immune from sin, vices, and crimes. Even to the visible head of the Church—the Vicar of Christ on earth—no guarantee of personal sanc-

tity was given by Our Lord. Consequently both visible head and members are men with all the frailties of human nature, and, if these frailties be not overcome by divine grace, head and members alike will sin. St. Leo the Great, far back in the fifth century, declared in regard to the Popes that the dignity of Peter would not fail, even in the hands of an unworthy heir (Serm. ii de sua assumpt. ad pontificat.) In other words, the Pope when speaking **ex cathedra,** is protected from error in matters of faith and morals by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. But he may be a great sinner so far as his personal life is concerned. He is not guaranteed freedom from error in his personal opinions, even in matters theological, nor is he necessarily infallible in his government of the Church.

It is evident, therefore, that considerations of the purely human side of the Church force the conviction that abuses are, in the long run, inevitable. Nor should we hesitate to make the admission. More harm has been done to the cause of the Church by ill-advised attempts to justify the personal conduct of sundry men in high ecclesiastical stations than by all the hostile criticism ever poured upon her. In these days of historical critique and scholarly examination of documentary evidence such methods of defense excite contempt. The Catholic should understand well that he is not bound to defend the personal actions of every man who wore the triple crown; but he **is** obliged to maintain that the deposit of faith has remained intact from the beginning—a doctrine with which a certain amount of development in the understanding and interpretation of dogmas is by no means inconsistent.

Now it is to the existence of such abuses that we have directed the attention of our readers in the preceding articles of this series. We admit freely that many of the clergy and laity alike had become quasi-paganized in the later decades of the Renaissance period; we agree that other deplorable conditions sprang from the secularizing of many bishoprics whose occupants were temporal princes; we concede that several of the Roman Pontiffs were certainly too tolerant of innovators who followed destructive programs.

But we deny, and deny emphatically, that the Church altered one jot or tittle of her doctrine. The "semper eadem" applies to the fourteenth century no less than to the tenth or the twentieth. If there were need of reform, it was a matter to be pursued entirely along disciplinary lines. And no one denies that such a reform was urgently demanded by the conditions of the age. But no reform whatever was called for in matters of doctrine. Had that been the case, the divinity of Christ Himself would have been impugned, since He had promised that the gates of hell would not prevail against His Church; that He Himself would be with it even to the consummation of the world; and that the Holy Ghost would abide with it forever. We cannot consistently hold, if we believe in Christ's divinity and therefore in His omnipotence, that He would be powerless to redeem His promises and prophecies in regard to His Church. The logic of events no less than the testimony of history forces us to believe that the alleged necessity of doctrinal reform involves as a consequence the repudiation of Christ's divinity. And, were this so, the whole case for Christianity collapses. All consideration of its claims is a waste of time.

Nevertheless, the history of the Reformation shows us that doctrinal change was the order of the day, whilst at the same time there was absolutely no disciplinary or personal improvement—but rather the contrary—in those who separated from the old Church. The principles adopted were, as we shall see, conducive first to religious and political tyranny, and then, in their later trend, to religious and political anarchy. But the Church, just because she was an organism full of vitality, responded to the demand for disciplinary reform, and successfully accomplished it in the sessions of the Council of Trent.

Martin Luther

We come now to Martin Luther. Whilst we are chiefly interested in his works, we will touch upon his personality and character insofar as they affected his career. Non-Catholic scholars no longer try to represent him as an angelic man; his own writings and those of his contemporaries have demolished that idea. All now admit that

he was a man of violent temper, coarse, vindictive, and with decided signs of a lack of mental equilibrium; but the non-Catholic historian adds that Luther, however crude he may have been, deserves credit as the first great instrument to break the shackles which the Roman Church fastened upon the human intellect; as the pioneer of popular liberties, the prophet of a purer and nobler religion. If we may believe some of the things that have been written, no man deserves so well of his fellow-men as does the monk of Wittenberg. In order to approve or refute the claim we must examine his work as it was conceived and carried out, and also its effects, even to our own day. This we shall proceed to do after a short sketch of Luther's early life.

Martin Luther was born at Eisleben in Saxony, November 10, 1483. On the following day—the feast of St. Martin of Tours—he was baptized, and received his name in honor of the great Bishop who was one of the glories of the Church eleven centuries before. His father was Hans Luther, his mother, Margaret Ziegler. Martin's early life, because of the severity of his parents, seems to have been far from happy. Hans Luther was a man of violent temper, who, shortly after his marriage, is said to have killed a herdsman in a dispute, and for that reason fled from his native hamlet to Eisleben. This story has been substantiated by careful investigation on the part of a Protestant, Mr. Henry Mayhew of London. An excellent study of the same episode from the pen of Rev. H. G. Ganss can be found in the American Catholic Quarterly Review, January, 1910. It seems, therefore, that the ill-temper and stubbornness which all his biographers declare that Luther often showed, was an inherited failing which goes far to explain many of his unreasonable and indefensible actions.

Luther's Scholastic Career

Luther's father wished to obtain for his son every possible advantage. At the age of fifteen he was enrolled in the Latin school at Eisenach, and at seventeen he began the study of law and philosophy in the University of Erfurt. Accounts of his scholarship at this period do not agree. If Melancthon is to be believed, Luther was an

intellectual prodigy; but then, Melancthon was speaking **pro domo.** Later writers—and Protestants, too—who have examined the evidence without prejudice, have discounted Melancthon's laudatory statement. A correct estimate of Luther at the age of twenty shows him to have been a moody, morose young man of fair intellectual attainments. His disposition was certainly not normal, and this must be borne in mind when pronouncing judgment on his career.

At the time of Luther's sojourn at Erfurt, the university, like other institutions of its kind elsewhere, contained two hostile factions,—the Humanists and the Scholastics. It was the same contest of forces which has been already described. Luther, who aspired to a legal career, found the scholastic philosophy more to his liking, but he did not neglect the classic authors. It seems, however, that Humanism finally exercised a great influence over his thoughts. Whilst he did not, indeed, associate much with the Humanists in the university, we are told that volumes of the classic authors were the only books which Luther brought with him when he entered the Augustinian monastery of Erfurt in July, 1505.

Luther's resolution to enter the religious life was formed suddenly, to the great wrath of his father, who wished to see him a legal luminary. It is hard to say just what prompted the step. Several biographers have related that the sudden death of a friend, and Luther's narrow escape from the perils of a thunderbolt, prompted him to seek the monastic life. This story has come down to us in varying forms, and it is impossible to determine now just how much truth it contains. If we follow the statements of Luther himself, we learn that he entered the monastery to escape the miseries of his home life, and this explanation has been accepted by several of his Protestant biographers—Leben, Hausrath, Beard, and others. Yet Luther is not silent about the thunderstorm. Bishop Stang in his little biography (page 3), quotes from De Wette's "Luthers Briefe" the following passage: "When I was surrounded with terror and the fear of death, I made a forced vow."

Whatever may have been the motives that led

Luther to embrace the religious life, there is no doubt that the step was most unfortunate. It seems certain that Luther had no vocation; that his sudden promise was little if anything more than a whim. On the seventeenth of July, 1505, he passed through the gates of his new monastic home, where he made his solemn vows eighteen months later. He was then ordained, and celebrated his first Mass Sunday, May 2, 1505.

Luther's life as a religious brings to the fore two points: a most unreasonable scrupulosity and a feeling that God was a Being terrible and vengeful above all else. The Divine Mercy seems to have made no impression on Luther's mind. These ideas increased his moroseness. In his first Mass he was so affected by the thought of an avenging God that he wished to stop, and was with difficulty persuaded by his Prior to continue. Nor was he afterwards able to shake off these sentiments. When all this is remembered, it is impossible to escape conviction that Luther's mental peculiarities utterly unfitted him, not only for the monastic life, but for any work which required good judgment and deliberation. Yet if ever a task demanded these qualities, it was that of getting rid of the pernicious influences of Renaissance Humanism and undue political interference in the external life of the Church.

Luther's monastic life went on for eight or nine years without any troubles save those which grew out of his over-scrupulous nature. About 1513 the change came.

VIII.

Indulgences Granted by Leo X.

We must now take up the events which led directly to Luther's revolt against the Church. The first was the erection of the new Basilica of St. Peter, in Rome,—a colossal work which had been commenced with his usual feverish energy by Julius II. in 1506. The second was a threat of the Ottoman Sultan, Selim I., to attack western Europe. The successful assault on Constantinople only six decades before was fresh in the minds of Christian princes, and Pope Leo X. took the initiative in making preparations to forestall Selim's designs. These required money; but Leo had no intention of stopping the work on St. Peter's, which had already cost a large sum. The needs of architects and builders must be promptly met. Leo was a bad financier, yet his ingenuity would have been taxed had he been the best in the world. He gave serious attention to both difficulties. A league could be formed against the Turks; but the money for St. Peter's must be obtained in some other way. The Pope therefore offered an indulgence, on the usual conditions, to those who contributed to such a worthy cause.

Luther's Change of Belief

It was around the doctrine of indulgences that the first great battle of the Reformation was to rage. Before that battle opened, however, it must be stated that the religious views of Martin Luther had undergone a change. At just what time, however, it would be impossible to say. In 1516 he had written a dissertation on the will of man, "against the doctrine of the Pope and the sophists" (Parsons, Studies in Church History, vol. III., p. 303), so we may surmise that he was then in a more or less rebellious mood. Bishop Stang thought that the "decided turn" came in 1513 or 1514, since Matthesius stated that Luther in 1515 was "already called a heretic." (Life of Martin Luther, p. 8). However this may be, the events that led to his formal separation from the Church were circumstances, not causes. All available testimony goes to show that Luther was

prepared to show an insubordinate spirit long before the trouble came. The controversy over the indulgence offered by Leo X. cannot in fairness be said to have brought about Luther's change of heart, though it certainly incited his revolt. It may well be doubted, however, if he fully understood his own state of mind, and the consequences to which it was likely to lead.

Nature of Indulgences

In Catholic doctrine an indulgence is the remission of the whole or a part of the temporal punishment due to sin, after the sin itself has been forgiven. The Church exercises the right to grant indulgences through the power of the keys given her by her Divine Founder, by virtue of which, for some sufficient and reasonable cause, she may apply His own superabundant merits and those of His saints. The remission of punishment obtained by an indulgence is, of course, extra-sacramental. In Baptism both guilt and penalties are remitted; in Penance the guilt is pardoned, and therefore the eternal penalty with it; but the temporal punishment is not remitted, and this must be satisfied before the soul, its sins having been forgiven, can enjoy the Beatific Vision. Such satisfaction may be made in this life, but if not so made, the Church teaches that there is a state after death, called purgatory, wherein the punishment is suffered.

Now indulgences give the sinner an opportunity of paying the temporal penalty due his sins, providing, of course, he has confessed and is truly repentant. As a condition for gaining an indulgence, some pious work is usually required. This may take the form of prayers, almsgiving, or the like. Then, too, since the Church is the custodian of the treasury of merits upon which the doctrine of indulgences is based, it requires an exercise of her jurisdiction to place these merits of Our Lord and the saints at the disposal of her children. The doctrine of the Communion of Saints recognizes the blessed in heaven, the militant Christians on earth, and the suffering souls in purgatory as members of one and the same body; hence the Church can make an indulgence applicable to those detained in purgatory, that thereby they may share in the good

works of their brethren who are still in the flesh, and so obtain aid in rendering to Almighty God the temporal satisfaction due Him. It is hardly necessary to add that there was absolutely nothing in the indulgence under discussion which was at variance in the least detail with the teaching of the Church.

Abuses

Whilst this is borne in mind, however, it must be candidly admited that the methods of preaching the indulgence were, in some places at least, open to severe and justifiable criticism. To take the most flagrant case: Albert of Brandenburg, Archbishop of Magdeburg, had received, whilst retaining that jurisdiction, another metropolitan see—Mayence—and the bishopric of Halberstadt as well. To allow one man to hold three sees was an abuse in itself; but the transaction unfortunately went further. Pastor asserts that Albert contracted a heavy debt because obliged to make an exorbitant offering for the pallium before taking possession of Mayence. (History of the Popes, vol. VII., p. 330). The business, however, was in reality much more reprehensible than that. The Archbishop was compelled to raise ten thousand ducats in order to buy off a rival candidate for the old Rhenish see, and this, as Father Ganss has aptly said, in order that he might enjoy a plurality of ecclesiastical offices. We may well agree that such a transaction smacked of simony. But the worst feature of the whole affair was the concession made by Leo X. to indemnify Albert. The latter was allowed to keep half the proceeds accruing in his jurisdiction from the offerings made to the building of St. Peter's as a result of the preaching of the indulgence.

Besides all this, it is undeniable that abuses arose from the methods employed in the preaching itself. For instance, the financial side was often urged above the real nature of the indulgence. Again, we find petty princes conniving at this state of affairs, and filching large portions of the returns. That Leo X. failed to realize the gravity of these things can be taken for granted; but, considering that he was absorbed in the arts and belles-lettres of the day, with a decided-

ly worldly following about him, it is impossible to acquit him of a large degree of carelessness. Blameless in his life, he yet failed to grasp the responsibilities of his great office. Gregory VII. or Innocent III. would have attacked the abuses at their roots; Leo, however good his intentions, paid not enough heed, and so the noxious weed flourished, to bring forth finally its bitter fruit of dispute, dissension, and disruption. It is also impossible to acquit the Roman Curia of showing too much anxiety over the financial returns,—a fact which naturally led to accusations of greed.

Tetzel

Albert of Brandenburg was authorized to arrange for the preaching of the indulgence in northern Germany, and his choice fell upon John Tetzel, a Dominican monk. The Augustinians hitherto had enjoyed the right to preach most of the papal indulgences in Germany, and Luther therefore resented Tetzel's appointment as a slight on his own Order. He attacked Tetzel violently, but with little show of reason. His utterances were of a vituperative or personal nature. However, since many non-Catholic writers, on the strength of Luther's statements, have penned harsh words against Tetzel, we may as well understand what manner of man he was.

Let it be said at once that there is absolutely no truth in the attacks that have been made on his moral character. Even Luther himself did not go so far. Nor is there any foundation for the statement that Tetzel sold pardons of sin for money, regardless of contrition. It may be fairly urged against him that he was imprudent. He certainly went astray on the doctrine of application of indulgences to the souls in purgatory by making it appear that a contribution would suffice, seemingly without consideration of the spiritual dispositions of the giver. It may well have been that Tetzel's enthusiasm led him to verbal excesses, or, quite possibly, that the large audiences drawn by his attractive personality flattered his vanity a little. At all events, he cannot be acquitted of advancing at least one loose opinion. In everything else modern criticism has vindicated him. The non-Catholic writer Beard says: "Even while he lived stories which con-

tained an element of legend gathered round his name, until at last, in the minds of the uncritical Protestant historians, he became the typical indulgence-monger, upon whom any well-worn anecdote might be fathered." (Martin Luther, p. 210).

The Ninety-five Theses

In the course of his preaching, Tetzel visited the neighborhood of Wittenberg, where Luther then was. Some of his hearers went to the latter for confession, and their statements of Tetzel's teaching were seemingly the prelude to a serious step on Luther's part.

This was the "nailing of the Ninety-five Theses" to the door of the castle church of Wittenberg,—an event which has been described by more than one perfervid speaker and writer as the momentous act which broke asunder the fetters binding men's minds to medieval obscurantism and superstition. And yet, Luther himself, on that last night of October in the year 1517, had no intention of throwing down the gauntlet as a challenge to battle other than academic. This is shown by his transmittal of the theses to the Archbishop of Mayence. The latter's advisers, however, held them to be heretical; and their findings, together with a copy of the theses themselves, were sent to Leo X. for his consideration.

In opposition to Luther's contentions, Tetzel adopted the "One Hundred and Six Theses" prepared by Conrad Wimpina, which he defended in January, 1518. No fault, on the whole, can be found with his course in this connection. It would be tedious to enter into all the details of the dispute; suffice it to say here that Luther finally appealed to the public by means of his "Sermon on Indulgences." A little later his defence of the Ninety-five Theses brought from Bishop Scultetus of Brandenburg the advice to refrain from any further published argument. The good prelate no doubt felt that the controversy would soon be forgotten if the disputants were given an opportunity to cool off.

But the discussion had already gone too far. Luther's insincerity was now manifest. In the early summer of 1518 he wrote to the Pope: "Most Holy Father, the propositions which I

put forth are in the form of theses, not of doctrines. . . . Prostrate at your feet, I resign to your Holiness all that I am and all that I possess. . . . I acknowledge your voice as that of Christ, who presides and speaks in you." Yet at this very time, as De Wette has it, Luther gave utterance to the following statement: "I am not certain whether the Pope is really Antichrist, or merely his apostle."

Luther Summoned to Rome

Leo X. at last took cognizance of Luther's attitude, and in August, 1518, the monk was summoned to Rome, to defend his conduct in person. Luther pleaded ill-health, and his appeals to the Emperor Maximilian and the Elector Frederick were so far successful that he was allowed a hearing at the Diet of Augsburg, summoned in the interest of the crusade against the Turks. Thither Luther repaired, and there he met the papal legate, Cardinal Cajetan, in October.

The meeting was fruitless; but it has become the center of myth and legend to such an extent that one is at a loss to know how to deal with it. This much is certain: Cajetan, who was a man of great learning and blameless life, has often been misrepresented. But it is not difficult to account for this fact. In the first place, Luther's accounts are seasoned with their writer's anger. In the second, the so-called Brief of Leo X. to Cajetan, couched in harsh terms and demanding the immediate arrest of the troublesome monk, is a forgery. Luther saw it after his interview with Cajetan, and we may well suppose that it inflamed him still more.

Karl von Miltitz, sent by the Pope on a special mission to the Elector Frederick, intervened a little later without authority to do so. He obtained from Luther several promises which were never fulfilled. The most unfortunate part of this affair was Miltitz' treatment of Tetzel, then stricken with his last illness. At Leipzig the envoy met the Dominican, charged him in severe language with all responsibility for Luther's conduct, and threatened him with the papal censure. But Leo had sanctioned none of these proceedings. Tetzel died August 11, 1519, an unfortunate, ill-treated man.

The Dispute with Eck: Luther's Doctrines

The famous disputation with John Eck, vice-chancellor of the University of Ingolstadt, had no general or widespread results. Luther here had as his ally one Andreas Carlstadt,* and the arguments took place at Leipzig in the presence of Duke George of Saxony. Carlstadt denied the liberty of man, whilst Luther argued against the papal supremacy. There is clear evidence that the heresiarch's conduct at Leipzig was violent to a degree, and the disputation, partly on this account and partly because of Eck's learning, had an effect on the audience quite the contrary of that hoped for by Luther and his friends.

Luther's doctrines had now taken on an air of finality. He taught that the source of faith is the Bible only. This faith, in his own words, "alone works justification; and a man is saved, and his sins are forgiven, by confidently believing." Original sin, according to Luther, destroyed man's free-will. He cannot, therefore, merit salvation. Confession and the Mass were rejected, as also the primacy of the Pope, indulgences, the invocation of the saints, all the sacraments except Baptism and the Eucharist, and this latter was so deformed as to twist it out of all agreement with the Catholic doctrine. After the consecration, (and, by the way, according to Luther all Christians are priests), the substance as well as the accidents of bread and wine remains, whilst the Body and Blood of Christ are present only to him who receives the sacrament. Hence reservation and worship of the Host are idolatry. Other doctrinal aberrations there were, but these are the most striking, and besides, they include the others by implication.

Dr. Eck went to Rome in the spring of 1520, whither he carried the books in which the new teachings were set forth. After full examination, forty-one points were declared to be heretical, and then, at the long last, on June 15 of the same year, Leo X. issued the Bull **Exsurge Domine,** in which Luther's doctrines were condemned, and their author given sixty days to retract before the sentence of excommunication should become effective.

* His family name was Bodenstein, and he was called Carlstadt from the place of his birth.

IX.

Publication of the Bull Exsurge

The Bull **Exsurge** was delivered for promulgation to the Papal legates Carraccioli (or Carricioli), Aleander, and Eck. As Bishop Stang remarks, the inclusion of the last named was "a sad mistake." For Luther had many friends, who regarded Eck with particular aversion, and the publication of the Bull therefore met with such a hostile reception in several places that the net result was still further to weaken the papal authority. Eck himself, through fear of personal violence, was obliged to withdraw from Wittenberg.

But even before the Bull had been published in Germany, Luther had appealed from the judgment of the Pope to that of an Ecumenical Council. The language used by him shows definitely enough that he considered himself no longer bound by that obedience to the Holy See which he had in former days so unreservedly professed. He published a pamphlet "Against the Execrable. Bull of Antichrist," in which he addressed Leo X. in this manner: "What mule, what ass, what mole, what stock may not discharge the functions of judge? Has not your vile face blushed thus to dare, with words of smoke, to oppose the thunders of the Gospel?"

Luther Burns the Bull

Such utterances were a prelude to a more dramatic act. On December 10, 1520, Melancthon gathered a crowd of the students and townsfolk of Wittenberg, and then, on a previously prepared pyre, were placed the writings of Eck and other opponents. To these was added the Corpus Juris Canonici, and, when the flames had consumed all, Luther himself threw upon the embers the Bull of Leo X. On the following day he declared to the students of the University: "It is full time that the Pope himself were burned. My meaning is, the Papal Chair, its false teachings, and its abominations, should be given to the flames." Several months before, Luther had said: "I despise alike the favor and fury of Rome. I do not wish to be reconciled with her, or ever

to hold any communion with her." The rupture was now complete.

Meanwhile certain changes of a secular nature were taking place. The King of Spain, Charles I., who had succeeded Ferdinand the Catholic in 1516, now obtained the imperial throne in succession to his grandfather, Maximilian, and the crown of the Holy Roman Empire was placed on his head at Aix-la-Chapelle, October 22, 1520. He is thenceforward known in history as the Emperor Charles V. Luther at once sought the favor of the new potentate in a letter full of misrepresentations: "For three years I have been the object of hatred, insults, and dangers. In vain have I cried for mercy, in vain offered to be silent, in vain proposed terms of peace, in vain demanded information. They seek to stifle me and the Gospel."

Luther Summoned to the Diet of Worms

Charles V. had given little personal attention to the religious troubles in Germany. The German Estates, however, had been summoned to meet in the Diet of Worms just before the first of February, 1521, and thither the Emperor bade Luther to repair. The legate Aleander regarded this step as mischievous. Luther's doctrines had already been condemned by the Holy See, and were therefore no longer a matter for discussion by a secular tribunal. But Aleander's protest was unheeded. The Emperor sent to Luther a letter in which he assured the "reformer" that neither violence nor ambuscade was to be feared. So Luther hesitated not to present himself before the Diet, and en route stirred up the people of Erfurt to a pitch which resulted, after his departure, in a discreditable piece of religious vandalism.

Leo X. sent Aleander and Carraccioli to represent him at Worms. Eck was also present. Luther attended a session for the first time on April 17, 1521, and was asked by Eck if he were the author of certain volumes which had been brought to the attention of the Diet. He replied in the affirmative. Eck then inquired if he were willing to repudiate the novel doctrines contained in them. Luther asked time for reflection before answering this question, and Charles V. readily granted

it. After the session was over, Luther was persuaded by some of the petty princes present to reject Eck's second question (Stang, Martin Luther, p. 27). Accordingly, on April 18, he complied with this advice, and refused to retract.

Luther Condemned by Charles V.

Charles V., though he had apparently shown little respect for the Bull **Exsurge** when he allowed Luther a sort of trial before the Diet of Worms, was none the less genuinely solicitous over the outcome of this religious quarrel which threatened to sever a large part of Germany from communion with the Apostolic See. Armstrong calls him "an honorable Christian gentleman, striving . . . to do his duty in that state of life to which an unkind Providence had called him." Nor did it take him long to decide whitherward that duty lay. On April 19 he sent a statement to the Diet in which he declared: "After the example of our forefathers, we will cling strongly and faithfully to the Christian faith and the Roman Church, and believe the holy fathers assembled in general councils, rather than this one friar. I repent of having waited so long, instead of having proceeded against him earnestly. Luther shall withdraw from this hour. I shall keep the word I have given, and the free safe-conduct. Take care that he returns safely to (the place) whence he came. But I forbid him to preach his pernicious doctrine to the people, and thus incite disorders."

Some of Luther's friends intervened to obtain a few days' respite. On the day before his departure from Worms (April 25), Luther was informed by the Elector Frederick of Saxony, of a plan to carry him off whilst on his way to Wittenberg. Accordingly, on the night of May 4 he was spirited away, and taken to the Castle of Wartburg, near Eisenach, where he remained until March, 1522.

The Political State of Germany

Before proceeding further, it is well to take some account of the political troubles which centered on, or grew out of, the religious agitation. Germany was in a deplorable condition in more ways than one. Princes were only too willing to

embrace a creed that promised them pretexts for confiscating the properties of the Church. The people of the larger towns were oppressed, and sought means whereby to overthrow their oppressors. The peasants were poverty-stricken, whilst the old orders of knighthood were maintaining a precarious existence. The great commercial prosperity of the Middle Ages was a thing of the past. In fine, the prevailing state of affairs demanded statesmanship of a high order, —a fact which was especially patent to Aleander, the Pope's legate. But Luther adroitly took advantage of the situation to mix the political troubles with the religious, thereby making both well-nigh impossible of solution; and to this proceeding must be ascribed the fierce issue of hatred, bloodshed, and disaster which came upon Germany in the wake of the so-called Reformation. So strongly was the necessity of political reform recognized prior to the Diet of Worms that Carraccioli, one of the Pope's representatives in that body, was especially entrusted with the discussion of civil problems, whilst the other legate, Aleander, was to occupy himself generally with the religious dispute.

An Alleged Incident at Worms

We will mention here a famous episode alleged to have taken place at Worms. It is one whose dramatic possibilities have been pushed to the farthest for the glorification of Luther. When the friar appeared before the Diet on April 18, 1521, and refused to recant, he is said to have ended with this declaration: "Here stand I. I can do no otherwise. So help me God. Amen." This has been hailed by historians and other writers as a truly wonderful example of the heroic. They "can do no otherwise" when they think of the great reformer, in the presence of the Emperor himself, surrounded by foes open and secret, the cruel legates of Leo X. ready to demand his blood, making such a sublime profession of faith. Of late the story has been related with gusto by several popular magazine paragraphers who have taken no pains to keep up with the progress of historical research; and this, primarily, is our reason for touching upon it here.

Its Falsity

We may as well say at once that the whole thing is a bit of fiction, on the same order as the famous "E pur si muove," ascribed to Galileo a century later. Such legends die hard. Even Mr. Lilly, a Catholic writer, avers, in his "Claims of Christianity," that there are few finer historical scenes than this of Luther's bold declaration. And when even one Catholic author is guilty of such a blunder, it can be easily imagined that our separated brethren have worked the legend overtime.

One of the latest offenders is a writer in the Saturday Evening Post. A reply in America (vol. XVI., No. 4, p. 88) is so apposite that it is worth while to quote from it at some length:

"Brave are the words, but they were never spoken by Luther. They have no place in the Latin account written by himself, which concludes, 'God help me. Amen,' a customary phrase at the end of a discourse, to be found elsewhere in Luther's writings. The form, 'Here I stand. I cannot do otherwise. God help me. Amen,' was first published at Wittenberg in 1521, where it was found desirable, writes Grisar, quoting the Protestant Wrede, 'to render the words more forcible and high-sounding.' 'There is not the faintest proof,' concludes Wrede, in his 'Deutsche Reichstagsakten,' II, 555, 'that the amplification came from anyone who actually heard the words.' The new form, testifies Kalkoff, another Protestant, in his 'Die Depeschen des Nuncius Aleander vom Wormser Reichstag,' p. 147, has 'no claim to credibility.' Further proof is given by Muller, Friedensburg, Burkhardt, Elter, Maurenbrecher, Kostlin-Kawerau, Kolds, Hausrath, and a host of other Protestant scholars. 'It would be well,' advises the Protestant Bohmer in his 'Luther im Lichte der Neueren Forschung,' 'not to quote any more those most celebrated of Luther's words as though they were his'."

So much for the historical scene than which there are "few finer."

The Edict of Charles V.

In conformity with the Emperor's orders, Aleander, after Luther's departure from Worms, drew up an edict condemning the doctrines of

Luther. It was signed May 26, 1521, but was to be published only after the expiration of the imperial letter of safe-conduct under the promises of which Luther had come to Worms. A paragraph from this edict will be of interest:

"By his writings Luther spreads bad fruits. He violates the number, order, and use of the sacraments, he stains the indestructible law of marriage, he covers the Pope with shameful and libellous epithets, he despises the priesthood, and induces the laity to wash their hands in the blood of the priests. He denies the freedom of the human will, and defends a loose and lawless life, as he dared to tear down the sacred bars of morality by publicly burning the ecclesiastical books of canon law. He reviles the Ecumenical Councils, and calls that of Constance, which gave back to the German nation peace and unity, a synagogue of the devil. Like an evil spirit in the habit of a monk, he gathers together old and new heresies, pretending to preach faith, while, under the device and pretext of evangelical liberty he is destroying the true faith and suppressing all good order" (Janssen, History of the German People, vol. II., p. 168).

Thus was the civil condemnation of the new teachings added to the ecclesiastical. Meantime, how fared Luther in the Castle of Wartburg?

X.

Luther's German Bible

A year's seclusion could not have been beneficial to a man as sorely tried in mind and soul as Luther. Nor is there wanting evidence, from his own pen, that storms of passion, of violent abuse and fierce anger, assailed him in the Wartburg with ever increasing fury. Yet these, which have made even some of his admirers suspect a strain of insanity, may be passed over to give place to a work which he then began—to complete early in 1534—namely, the translation of the Bible into German. In a few months the New Testament had been printed, and, offered for sale at a small price, the edition was speedily exhausted and a new one called for.

There can be no doubt that this work contributed in no minor degree to the spread of the Reformation in Germany. For whilst it was offensively illustrated and supplied with notes designed to incite controversy, "its linguistic merits were indisputable; its influence on national literature most potent. Like all his (Luther's) writings in German, it was the speech of the people; it struck the popular taste and charmed the national ear. It unfolded the affluence, clarity, and vigor of the German tongue in a manner and with a result that stands almost without a parallel in the history of German literature" (Ganss, art. "Luther," Cath. Encyc., vol. IX., p. 447). The character of the work, other than literary, is described in the same article as follows: "While from the standpoint of the philologist it is worthy of the highest commendation, theologically it failed in the essential elements of a faithful translation. By attribution and suppression, mistranslation and wanton garbling, he made it the medium of attacking the old Church, and vindicating his individual doctrines."

National Character of Protestantism

We may note, in passing, the national character of the appeal which the new translation made. As stated earlier in these articles, it was to a misdirected sense of nationalism that the Reform-

ation owed much of its success. In Germany, especially, were political matters propitious. In the second half of the fifteenth century, Roman law had been introduced "in place of the old Germanic systme, and royal absolutism then pressed ever more heavily upon the masses. One of the causes of the success of Lutheranism was its national character. The feeling was, Germany must shake off the Roman yoke: the Holy Empire is Roman before being Germanic: it is Pope who crowns Emperor. Lutheran Germany shall be self-contained and self-sufficient" (Fr. J. Bourg, S. J., "Lutheranism," History of Religions, vol. IV.)

As we shall see, the "national character" in the spread of Protestantism was no less evident elsewhere than in Germany. There everything that might aid it as a national movement was welcomed; and certainly Luther's Bible could not but supply a great impetus. It must not be inferred from this statement, however, that the Holy Scriptures were unknown to the people until the third decade of the sixteenth century. Quite the contrary. There were many vernacular translations, useful, even though their archaic lagnuage did not conduce to free circulation; a difficulty which Luther's version avoided. It is a time-honored fable that the Reformation introduced the Bible to the people, and the fable, unfortunately, still persists. We have all heard the story that Luther chanced to come upon a copy of the Bible chained to a desk, and furtively turned its pages whilst he read with delight the inspired words of which he had before known nothing.

The Bible Before the Reformation

A simpler way of keeping Holy Writ from the faithful would have been, to destroy it altogether, and it is wonderful that this thought does not occur to the mind of the simplest bumpkin who has been regaled with the old story. But, as has just been said, that story persists. It is still a commonplace belief that one of the glories of Protestantism is a "free Bible"; that there was complete ignorance of its contents in the "Dark" Ages. Let us see what Protestant writers have had to say on this point. First, as to the alleged

antagonism of the Popes, Dean Maitland declares

"I have not found anything about the arts and engines of hostility, the blind hatred of half-barbarian kings, the fanatical fury of their subjects, or the reckless antipathy of the Popes. I do not recollect any instance in which it is recorded that the Scriptures, or any part of them were treated with indignity, or less than profound respect" (The Dark Ages, p. 240).

Later in the same work (p. 476) he refers thus to the wide use made of Holy Writ:

"The writings of the Dark Ages are, if I may use the expression, **made of the Scriptures.** I do not merely mean that the writers constantly quoted the Scriptures and appealed to them on all occasions, though they did this, and it is a strong proof of their familiarity with them; but I mean that they thought, and spoke, and wrote their thoughts and words, and phrases of the Bible; and they did this constantly, and habitually, and as the natural mode of expressing themselves."

The hostile Karl Pearson, writing in The Academy, August, 1886, remarks: "The Catholic Church has quite enough to answer for, . . . but in the fifteenth century it certainly did not hold back the Bible from the folk, and it gave them in the vernacular a long series of devotional works which for language and religious sentiment has never been surpassed; indeed, we are inclined to think it made a mistake in allowing the masses such ready access to the Bible. It ought to have recognized the Bible once for all as a work absolutely unintelligible without a long course of historical study; and, so far as it was supposed to be inspired, very dangerous in the hands of the ignorant."

Here the usual charge is turned clean around!

A writer in the Athenaeum, commenting on Rev. Dr. Andrew Edgar's "Bibles of England," gives some information respecting the publication of vernacular versions of the Bible before Luther's revolt, and after the invention of printing:

"Dr. Edgar still repeats the oft-exploded notion that the Catholic Church 'had a widespread horror of Scripture translations, whether accompanied with notes or not, and however faultlessly exe-

cuted.' He does not seem to know that long before the Reformation every Catholic nation all over Europe had versions of the Bible in the vernacular of the country. Between 1477, when the first edition of the French New Testament was published at Lyons, and 1535, when the first French Protestant Bible was published, upwards of twenty editions of the Bible in the French vernacular issued from the Catholic press. In Germany, prior to the publication of the first edition of Luther's Bible in 1534, no fewer than thirty Catholic editions of the entire Scriptures, and parts of the Bible, appeared in the German vernacular. In Italy, the very seat of the Papacy, two editions of an Italian translation of the whole Bible appeared in 1471. and several other editions appeared prior to the Reformation. These facts any student can verify by a visit to the British Museum, where most of the Bibles are to be seen" (Athenaeum, No. 3226, Aug. 24, 1889, p. 246).

* * *

We have digressed somewhat from the continuity of our subject, though not uselessly, we hope. Let us now take up again the thread of our narrative.

Another Work of Luther

Another work written by Luther in the Wartburg was the "Opinion on Monastic Orders." It was a command, so to speak, addressed to monks and nuns to put aside their vows, and marry. Father Ganss says of it that "it made the bold proclamation of a new code of ethics: that concupiscence is invincible." It certainly had a deplorable effect. Luther himself later gave a specific example of his opinion of religious vows by marrying Catherine von Bora, a nun. And his writings are full of expressions which show at once the violence of his passions and his hatred of the Papacy. For instance, he says:

"It is far easier to endure a prison than to burn with hot passion. I myself have experienced this difficulty. The more I mortified my body, the greater the efforts I made to conquer my desires, the more fiercely they impelled me. Even supposing that a man had the gift of chastity bestowed on him by nature, he ought nevertheless

to marry in pure defiance of the Pope."

In passing, we may remark that this rebellious strain which invariably crops out in Luther's writings has received recognition in our own time at the hands of Giosue Carducci, dead but a decade, in his blasphemous Hymn to Satan:

"Gitta la tonaca
Martin Lutero!
Gitta a tuoi vincoli,
Uman pensiero!

"Salute, O Satana!
O rebellione!
O forza vindice
Della ragione!"

This linking of the name of Luther with that of the prince of darkness, by the poet of modern "free-thought," may shock the sensibilities of some, yet who will say that it is altogether incongruous?

At the period of which we write, Luther's works had gained a wide circulation even beyond the limits of Germany. The findings of the ecclesiastical courts and those of the Diet of Worms were well known everywhere, and learned men had therefore entered the lists against the heresiarch. Henry VIII., King of England, had written his "Assertio Septem Sacramentorum"—Defense of the Seven Sacraments—of which an edition was brought out a few years ago by Rev. Louis O'Donovan, S. T. L. Henry was a better theologian than Luther; but he received, none the less, a reply written from the Wartburg in July and August, 1521, in which Luther styled him an ass, a fool, and a liar. The encounter between the English king and the apostate friar seems strange in the light of Henry's later career. In 1521, however, he had not fallen victim to the lust which afterward ruined him, and his "Assertio" certainly merited the title "Defender of the Faith," bestowed on him by Leo X., and borne—why?—by his successors ever since, down to and including George V.

Disturbances at Wittenberg

Meantime, disturbances were of common occurrence. At Wittenberg Andreas Carlstadt, "known to us," says Schaff (History of the Chris-

tian Church, vol. VI., p. 378), "from his ill success at the Leipsig disputation," began to preach doctrines of a destructive character, which made rapid progress. His opposition to statues and pictures led him to ask the town-council to decree their removal; but, before this could be done, a mob sacked the church of the Franciscans. The sects known as Anabaptists and Sacramentarians "outstripped Luther in their violences" (Bourg). About the beginning of 1522 two men, Nicholas Storch and Mark, or Marx Thoma Stuebner, fanatics from Zwickau, as Schaff calls them, arrived in Wittenberg, and were joined, a little later, by Thomas Muenzer, "a millennarian enthusiast and eloquent demagogue." "Thev boasted of visions, dreams, and direct communications with God and the Angel Gabriel, disparaged the written word and regular ministry, rejected infant baptism, and predicted the overthrow of the existing order of things, and the near approach of a democratic millenium" (Schaff, op. cit., p. 381). Melancthon, who had been supporting Carlstadt, was nonplussed when the latter threw in his lot with these "Zwickau Prophets." At any rate, he was too timid to oppose the violent proceedings that followed, and the Elector declined to interfere on the ground that the debates were theological, and he, as a layman, could not pronounce judgment. But, though Carlstadt associated with the fanatics, and even assumed a sort of leadership, he did not, as is generally believed, incite their excesses. Yet his innovations were of a kind in themselves likely to cause disorder, and the quasi-political utterances of the Zwickau Prophets added fuel to the flame of rebellion. Such, in brief, was the state of affairs when Luther, leaving the Wartburg, appeared suddenly in Wittenberg in March, 1522, and attacked Carlstadt's innovations, "every one of which," says Father Ganss, "he subsequently adopted." The two now definitely parted company; and Luther in the end triumphed over his quondam supporter. To combat Carlstadt he had, for the moment, again assumed the garb and manners of a monk.

Death of Leo X.

Three months before these happenings, Pope Leo X. died suddenly, December 1, 1521. He had completely failed to understand the scope and ex-

tent of Luther's revolt. The Bull **Exsurge,** it is true, condemned the latter's teachings, of which the incompatibility with Catholic doctrines was patent enough; but Leo did not appreciate the conditions that had led to the troubles. He could not see that the loose discipline of the day urgently demanded reform, and hence he made no effort to remove the abuses which, unhappily, had lent some color to Luther's attacks. Yet, in spite of all the hard things said of his neglect by Catholic historians, it is possible to be too severe on him. Temperamentally he was unfitted to deal with the burning questions of his day. But what he lacked was possessed to the full by his saintly and high-minded successor.

Pope Adrian VI.

Adrian Florenz was born at Utrecht in the Netherlands, March 2, 1459. He was educated at Louvain, studying philosophy for two years, and theology and canon law for ten. At that time, Pastor says, the University of Louvain "was hardly touched by humanism" (History of the Popes, vol. IX., p. 36). As a professor of philosophy in the College of Eber, and subsequently parish priest of Goedereede in South Holland, he enjoyed a high reputation.

In 1515 he went to Spain on a diplomatic mission. The Archduke Charles, afterwards Emperor, had been his pupil some years before; and in Spain, on the death of Ferdinand the Catholic, he assumed the provisional government, having already secured for Charles the full rights of inheritance to the Spanish crown (Pastor, op. cit. vol. IX., p. 40). His association with the famous Cardinal Ximenes convinced the latter of his great merit, and, as a result, Adrian was made Bishop of Tortosa in June, 1516, and soon after, Inquisitor for Aragon and Navarre. In July, 1517, he was created Cardinal-priest of the title of SS. John and Paul, and when Charles went to Germany, in May, 1520, Adrian was named his viceroy in Spain.

His Election

The onerous duties of this position kept him busy. He was not one of the Cardinals who entered the conclave to elect a successor to Leo X. The conclave voted for the first time on Decem-

ber 30, 1521, and on January 9, 1522, came to the conclusion that no Cardinal present could be elected. The attention of those present therefore centered on the absent Cardinals, and on that very day the Bishop of Tortosa in distant Spain was chosen to fill the vacant Throne of Peter. At Vittoria, on January 24, the news reached him, and on February 9 the messenger of the conclave handed the new Pope the official confirmation of the report.

He retained his own Christian name, styling himself Adrian VI. He was the last non-Italian elected to the Papacy, and his northern origin augured well for success in healing the deplorable religious quarrel in Germany. So great were the difficulties of travel that he did not reach Rome until August 28. His coronation took place on the following Sunday—August 31.

His Character

Under a Pontiff like Leo X. it was inevitable that unworthy men should have obtained positions of trust and eminence. Adrian from the beginning was determined to root out this abuse, and therefore he was not popular, even with most of those who had elected him. Besides, he was a "barbarian,"—a fact which made him more or less inacceptable to all Italians. Hence false descriptions of his personality and his character have come down to us, and have been eagerly seized upon to defame him. Yet he was undoubtedly a man of the highest moral worth. He attacked the abuses within the Church so vigorously that Catholic writers have though his words an exaggeration of the real state of affairs. Whilst indeed there may be a little of this from the rhetorical standpoint, there is none from the practical, as Pastor shows (History of the Popes, vol. IX., p. 138).

We come now to the efforts made by this austere and upright man to combat the evils whose purport his predecessor had unfortunately underestimated, if, indeed, he had heeded some of them at all.

XI.

The Diet of Nuremberg

Adrian VI. lost no time in adopting measures designed to put an end to the religious troubles agitating Europe. He rightly began with the Roman Curia, but made slow progress, because the evils which he sought to eradicate were deep seated and of long standing. Meanwhile Luther was not idle. A month before Adrian's arrival in Rome he had published a tirade, "Against the Falsely Called Ecclesiastical State of Pope and Bishops," in which he boldly declared for the destruction of the bishoprics of Germany. On the very day after Adrian's coronation, the German Estates were summoned to meet at Nuremberg, and thither Adrian sent as his legate Francesco Chieregati, Bishop of Teramo.

Chieregati set out on his difficult mission without delay. Before the end of September he had explained to the Archduke Ferdinand Adrian's plans of reform, and urged measures to prevent the further spread of heresy. The war against the Turks being still in progress, the legate announced the Pope's intention of supporting it. This, too, was his first announcement to the Diet when it met in November. Chieregati was a man of unusual prudence. He deemed it unwise to bring before the assemblage the sad state of religious affairs in Germany, until a favorable opportunity presented itself. It was not then, until December 10 that he broached the difficulties arising from Luther's conduct, and told of the Pope's intention to correct internal abuses. On January 3, 1523, he read a Brief addressed by Adrian to the Diet, and with it an Instruction. In the Pope's name he then demanded that the Edict of Worms be rigidly observed.

Adrian's "Instruction"

Pastor, in his admirable History of the Popes, (vol. IX. p. 132,) calls the Instruction a document "unique in the history of the Papacy," and declares that it "is of exceptional importance to an understanding of Adrian's plans of reform,

and his opinion of the state of things." After bidding the German people to remember their ancient loyalty to the faith, he tells them to consider the danger of rebellion against all higher authority arising from a doctrine preached under the guise of evangelical freedom, and offering encouragement to disregard sacred vows. But the last part of the Instruction is "the most remarkable," as Pastor says, since it sets forth "with broad-minded candor the grounds on which the religious innovators justified their defection from the Church on account of the corruption of the clergy, as well as that corruption itself." It is therefore worth while to quote this portion as Pastor gives it (op. cit., pp. 134-5):

"You are also to say," wrote Adrian to Chieregati, "that we frankly acknowledge that God permits this persecution of His Church on account of the sins of men, and especially of prelates and clergy: of a surety the Lord's arm is not shortened that He cannot save us, but our sins separate us from Him, so that He does not hear. Holy Scripture declares aloud that the sins of the people are the outcome of the sins of the priesthood; therefore, as Chrysostom declares, when our Saviour wished to cleanse the city of Jerusalem of its sickness, He went first to the Temple to punish the sins of the priests before those of others, like a good physician who heals a disease at its roots. We know well that for many years things deserving of abhorrence have gathered round the Holy See; sacred things have been misused, ordinances transgressed, so that in everything there has been a change for the worse. Thus it is not surprising that the malady has crept down from the head to the members, from the Popes to the hierarchy.

"We all, prelates and clergy, have gone astray from the right way, and for long there is none that has done good; no, not one. To God, therefore, we must give all the glory and humble ourselves before Him; each one of us must consider how he has fallen and be more ready to judge himself than to be judged by God in the day of His wrath. Therefore, in our name, give promises that we shall use all diligence to reform before all things the Roman Curia, whence,

perhaps, all these evils have had their origin; thus healing will begin at the source of the sickness. We deem this to be all the more our duty, as the whole world is longing for such reform. The papal dignity was not the object of our ambition, and we would rather have closed our days in the solitude of private life; willingly would we have put aside the tiara; the fear of God alone, the validity of our election, and the dread of schism, decided us to assume the position of Chief Shepherd. We desire to wield our power not as seeking dominion or means for enriching our kindred, but in order to restore to Christ's bride, the Church, her former beauty, to give help to the oppressed, to uplift men of virtue and learning; above all, to do all that beseems a good shepherd and a successor of blessed Peter.

"Yet let no man wonder if we do not remove all abuses at one blow, for the malady is deeply rooted and takes many forms. We must advance, therefore, step to step, first applying the proper remedies to the most difficult and dangerous evils, so as not by a hurried reform to throw all things into greater confusion than before. Aristotle well says: 'All sudden changes are dangerous to states.'"

While, as before stated, there may be a bit of obvious rhetorical exaggeration in one or two lines of Adrian's letter to Chieregati, it is, on the whole, an accurate if appaling indictment of the abuses which had crept into ecclesiastical administration. But it must be noted, on the other hand, that the Church had within her abundant vitality, and so in time these abuses were shaken off. It is true that the cure was not accomplished in Adrian's brief reign, for the disease was old and obstinate. Nevertheless it was finally effected, and the words of Christ, that the gates of hell should not prevail against the Church, were verified. If anything is certain, it is this: no merely human institution, sorely troubled by the disgraceful conduct of its own members and assailed from without by its enemies, could have survived the difficulties through which the Church passed in the first half of the sixteenth century.

No Justification for Doctrinal "Reform"

Another point to be noted: Adrian's Instruction indicates exactly the nature of the malady. It was entirely disciplinary; no doctrinal points were affected. Therefore any suggestion of reform should have taken cognizance, as did the Pope's, of administrative abuses only; and here Luther's attack was wholly unreasonable, since he repudiated doctrines of apostolic antiquity. His proceedings can be justified only by the rejection of Christ's promise that the gates of hell should not prevail against His Church; and surely, if her doctrine had become corrupted, then Christ had not kept His promise—a postulate which, to the Catholic, is sheer blasphemy. The Protestant may not regard it so, since the Reformation itself has altered his concept of the Church and made religious truth something merely subjective. Yet if there be any force in logic, and any logic in the sequence of historical events, the candid non-Catholic will be driven to take the Catholic view, whether it be acceptable to his prejudices or not. And, as a matter of fact, many non-Catholic writers, after a study of the Reformation movement, have unequivocally taken the Catholic view. Newman, for instance, may be said to have entered the Church by the gate of history; and the attitude of Protestants like Augustus Schlegel and Novalis adds its testimony to the historic unity of the Church.

The Papal Constitution of the Church

It is, then, failure to understand the visible bond of unity that leads otherwise devout non-Catholics into anomalous arguments about the Reformation. Dr. Brownson well said: "We have our theory of the movement . . . and we ascribe the real cause of that movement to the failure of the pastors of the Church, very extensively, to insist in their primary instructions to their flocks, on the **essentially** papal constitution of the Church. They may have taught with sufficient distinctness that the Pope is at the summit of the hierarchy, but they did not with sufficient distinctness that he is also at its basis, is its foundation, the rock on which the whole Church rests. The theories, in regard to the papacy, of Marsilius of Padua and John of Jan-

dun, as well as others, very generally held by the princes, courtiers, and jurisconsults, were suffered to prevail, not in the schools, not in the formal teaching of the Church, but in the popular mind, and to become to a fearful extent the public opinion of the Christian world." (Works, vol. VII. p. 180). These false theories received an impetus from the sojourn of the Papacy at Avignon, from the Great Schism of the West, and from the secularized papal court of the Renaissance period; and it was just because of their prevalance that Adrian VI. was unable, in his brief reign, to bring about the reform he so ardently desired. His Instruction unhappily produced little effect on the Diet of Nuremberg. The prelates "felt themselves affronted," whilst "among the Catholic secular princes opinion was for the most part 'out-and-out Lutheran'" (Pastor, vol. IX. p. 141).

Failure of Adrian's Plans

Adrian's efforts to heal the German trouble, then, were rendered nugatory. True, the Diet agreed to uphold bishops who would take steps against errant ecclesastics, but Luther was not thus to be caught. The Pope, therefore, turned to Erasmus and to the University of Cologne, urging "a literary warfare with the friends of Luther" (December 1, 1522). But Erasmus, whilst hoping that the doctrinal novelties might be suppressed, at first showed no inclination to comply with the Pope's request, but later on, he entered the lists. Quite possibly his somewhat feeble health may have deterred him at first. But whatever the reason, his delay was unfortunate.

On the last day of May, 1523, Adrian canonized Benno, Bishop of Meissen (Misnia), and Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, the latter of whom flourished three-quarters of a century before. (To show, by-the-way, that those who contributed to the spread of solid learning in Renaissance days were not all indifferent Catholics, we may remark that St. Antoninus was one of the first to deny the alleged influence of comets on

the world's affairs, and he dismissed the supposition that comets foretell evil by stating positively that they are of natural origin. "Constat quod cometes habent causam naturalem." (Summa Historialis, cited in The Month, January, 1907.) The new honors to the former led Luther to publish a pamphlet, "Against the New Idol and the Old Devil," in which he called Adrian "an impious hypocrite, the determined enemy of God's word, who . . . canonizes the slave of Rome, or rather the devil himself." This tirade drew from Erasmus the following words in a letter to Melancthon: "Who can convince me that those are guided by the spirit of Christ, whose manners are so opposed to the doctrines of Christ? Formerly the Gospel made the fierce mild, the spoiler merciful, the turbulent peaceful, the slanderer charitable; but these excite fury, take by fraud the property of others, create disturbances everywhere, and speak evil of the good and just" (Stang, Martin Luther, pp. 44-45).

That Erasmus had good reason to speak thus may be learned from the rapidly moving course of events in Germany. Adrian VI. died, a disappointed and heart-broken man, September 14, 1523. His successor, Clement VII. (Giuliano de' Medici), was a cousin of Leo X. Although he had given evidence of efficiency and was free from extravagance, yet he lacked decision. He had something of the temperament of Louis XVI. of France and of Pope Pius IX., though with him it originated in his over-subtle statesmanship. In consequence, his pontificate promised to be, in a temporal way, disastrous, and so indeed it was.

The Peasants' War

The wretched condition of the German peasants has already been touched upon. Here and there, in the first year of Clement's pontificate, risings took place, but they amounted to little, and Luther himself generally discountenanced them. Yet they were bound to produce terrible results. There was a sharp line between the rich and the poor. The former had obtained the properties of the guilds, the dissolution of which had killed industry; princes connived at the seiz-

ure of monastic properties; the extensive commercial operations of the Hanseatic League were a thing of the past, and Luther himself, and his friends as well, were preaching the gospel of discontent with a fury which justified the words of Erasmus to Melancthon. The second meeting of the Diet of Nuremberg in November, 1524, took no measures to prevent the threatened catastrophe. Clement's legate, Campeggio, received a cold reception. Charles V. refused to sanction the Diet's proceedings, and brought on himself a frantic attack from Luther, who called him, and with him Henry VIII. of England and others, "mad, stupid, raging, furious fools." In view of the violence of his language, is it any wonder that Luther's followers at last translated it into action, and rose to pillage and slaughter?

"The insurrection broke out," writes the non-Catholic historian, Philip Schaff, "in Swabia, on the Upper Danube, and the Upper Rhine, along the Swiss frontier. . . . In 1525 it extended gradually all over South-Western and Central Germany. The rebels destroyed the palaces of the bishops, the castles of the nobility, burned convents and libraries, and committed other outrages. Erasmus wrote to Polydore Virgil, from Basel, in the autumn of 1525: 'Every day there are bloody conflicts between the nobles and the peasants, so near to us that we can hear the firing, and almost the groans of the wounded.' In another letter he says: 'Every day priests are imprisoned, tortured, hanged, decapitated, or burnt.'

"At first the revolution was successful. Princes, nobles and cities were forced to submit to the peasants. If the middle classes, which were the chief supporters of Protestant doctrines, had taken sides with the peasants, they would have become irresistible.

"But the leader of the Reformation threw the whole weight of his name against the revolution" (Hist. of the Christian Church, vol. VI., pp. 444-5).

And a little earlier (p. 440), he remarks:

"The ecclesiastical radicalism at Wittenberg was the prelude of a more dangerous and social radicalism, which involved a large portion of Ger-

many in confusion and blood. Both movements had their roots in crying abuses; both received a strong impetus from the Reformation, and pretended to carry out its principles to their legitimate consequences; but both were ultra- and pseudo-Protestant, fanatical, and revolutionary."

A Misapplied Palliative

Schaff, whilst admitting the facts, endeavors to palliate their significance. It is entirely true that the "political radicalism" in question had its root in "crying abuses," but it is equally true that the "ecclesiastical radicalism" did not. What, for example, is there in the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist to justify Carlstadt's fantastic conception as a purer expression of faith? What is there in infant baptism to demand the application of the harsh term, "crying abuse"? Nothing at all, even to the unbeliever. Whilst it is true that Luther repudiated Carlstadt after the disturbances at Wittenberg, it is notorious that later he adopted every one of his erstwhile friend's theories. When, therefore, we assent to the proposition that "both movements"—the ecclesiastical radicalism and the social—"received a strong impetus from the Reformation, and pretended to carry out its principles to their legitimate consequences," we must also believe, if Luther is to be considered an exponent of Protestantism, that both were **not** "pseudo-Protestant," though they certainly were fanatical and revolutionary. The violent language of Luther's diatribes exicted and inflamed the peasants. Of this there can be no doubt whatever.

Luther's Responsibility

But, says Schaff, "the leader of the Reformation threw the whole weight of his name against the revolution." This statement is a half-truth, and well illustrates the aphorism, "Suppresio veri, suggestio falsi." Let us examine it.

In the first place, Luther's negation of free-will and his doctrine of private judgment were bearing evil fruit. In a letter to some of his followers at Antwerp, he says: "One rejects baptism, another the Eucharist; . . . . some deny the divinity of Christ. One says this; the other that; there are as many sects as there are

heads. Every booby imagines himself inspired by the Holy Ghost, and wants to be a prophet" (De Wette, cited by Stang, op. cit., p. 55). It is evident, then, that "Protestantism" can be taken as nothing more than a general term to describe the religious anarchy which existed as early as 1525. (As a name, the word had not yet come into use.) Now Luther's disciples journeyed in all directions, preaching this, that, and the other novelty, some of which certainly departed from their master's teaching, but which just as certainly would not have been proclaimed were it not for the "right of private judgment." The Swabian peasants, at the beginning of their revolt, drew up "a sort of political and religious creed," consisting of twelve articles "based upon texts drawn from the writings of Luther" (Alzog). Some of their demands were reasonable enough; but in practice they soon overstepped those demands. The first was the right to elect their own pastors,—a thing which Luther did not then approve. The twelfth sets forth that the other demands shall be tested by Scripture, and if found not to agree with it, shall be withdrawn. One can readily imagine the lack of success, in view of the alleged right of private judgment, which would attend any effort to realize this twelfth article.

At first Luther undoubtedly sympthized with the peasants. A. F. Pollard, M. A., professor of constitutional history in University College, London, writing in the Cambridge Modern History (Vol. II., p. 193) says that he "could not resist the temptation to attribute the ruin which threatened the princes to their stiffnecked rejection of Lutheran dogma; and his invectives poured oil on the flames of revolt." And this is just what was to be expected. If preachers of revolution are allowed license today, we look to see results written in blood. The Haymarket riot in Chicago, in 1886, was rightly attributed to the freedom with which anarchists attacked the social order. When President McKinley was assassinated in 1901, the press of the United States rang with denunciations of open, loud-mouthed anarchy. Why should Luther's inflammatory utterances be regarded as exceptional? Schaff

says: "In the battle of words he allowed himself every license; but there he stopped." But there his deluded followers did not stop. Even Dr. Martin Philipsson, former professor of history in the University of Bonn, says that princes like "Philip of Hesse and John of Saxony wavered a moment in their allegiance to the new doctrine, which, in spite of Luther's foresight, they considered, not wholly without reason, as answerable for the uprising of the peasants" (Age of the Reformation, p. 99).

When Luther saw, however, that the violence was likely to get beyond control, he hastily published his "Exhortation to Peace." It was now too late. Blood soon flowed like water. "The peasants," says Stang, "tried to justify their cruel and vandalic destruction of life and property by appealing to the Gospel as interpreted by Luther's doctrine; and they claimed to be the most zealous defenders of this. But the Wittenberg monk, not being particularly desirous of shining as the instigator of such a riotous revolt, printed a reply to their manifesto. In this he attempted to cast the disgrace of having caused the rebellion upon his enemies, whom he styled 'the prophets of murder'" (Luther, p. 58).

But the attempt was a palpable failure. Luther then "dipped his pen in blood, and burst out in a most violent manifesto 'against the rapacious and murderous peasants.' He charged them with doing the Devil's work under pretense of the Gospel. He called upon the magistrates to 'stab, kill, and strangle' them like mad dogs. He who dies in defense of the government dies a blessed death, and is a true martyr before God. A pious Christian should rather suffer a hundred deaths than yield a hair of the demands of the peasants.

"So fierce were Luther's words, that he had to defend himself in a public letter to the chancellor of Mansfeld (June or July, 1525.) He did not, however, retract his position. 'My little book,' he said, 'shall stand, though the whole world should stumble at it.' He repeated the most offensive passages, even in stronger language, and declared that it was useless to reason with rebels, except by the fist and the sword."

(Schaff, Vol. VI, pp. 446-7.) This conduct is excused on the ground that it rose from "his sincere conviction of duty to the magistrate in temporal matters, and to the cause of the Reformation which was threatened with destruction." But he who made the fault should not have been so ready to punish it.

The rest of the story is soon told. The flame of revolt was speedily quenched in the blood of more than one hundred thousand of its deluded votaries. Eleven or twelve hundred convents and castles had been burned, villages were ruined, the fields lay untilled, the country was devastated. Fewer episodes in history are more sanguinary, and none reflects greater disgrace on those responsible for it.

XII.

Luther's Marriage

A month after the batle of Frankenhausen, so destructive to the peasants' cause, Luther secretly married, June 13, 1525, a nun, Catherine von Bora, who with eight others had "escaped" from the Cistercian convent of Nimptschen with Luther's connivance. Thus he put into practice his oft-repeated statement that priests and nuns ought to marry, if for no other reason than to defy the Pope. "On what pretense can man have interdicted marriage, which is a law of nature? 'Tis as though we were forbidden to eat, to drink, to sleep. That which God has ordained and regulated, is no longer a matter of the human will, which we may adopt or reject with impunity. 'Tis the most certain sign of God's enmity to Popedom, that He has allowed it to assail the conjugal union of the sexes" (Table Talk, Bohn's ed., p. 200). This remark refers, of course, to religious celibacy. But the looseness of Luther's moral opinions cannot be doubted in view of his language, which at times is utterly obscene. Hallam did not hesitate to pronounce the explanation of his theories not only indelicate, but full of "gross filthiness." And Cobbett, another non-Catholic, remarks that "all accounts agree that Luther was a profligate man" (Hist. of the Reformation, p. 66). His doctrine of justification by faith alone was assuredly no remedy for the storms of passion which assailed him. And who has not heard of the categorical expression of that doctrine, found in a letter written to Melancthon in August, 1521? "Be a sinner, and sin boldly; but believe more boldly still" (Grisar. Martin Luther, vol. III., p. 196). Such words explain the moral license which Luther allowed himself when discussing delicate matters.

Philip of Hesse

It may be well to narrate here, by anticipation, Luther's sanction of bigamy in the case of the Landgrave Philip of Hesse. This man, a thorough libertine, asked permission in 1539 to take a second wife because he lived "continually in adultery." The request seems to have embarrassed

Luther, but the permission was soon forthcoming. After consultation with his Wittenberg friends, a long reply deprecating Philip's intention, but concluding with the following remarkable words, was sent to the landgrave: "If, however, your highness is utterly determined upon marrying a second wife, we are of opinion that it ought to be done secretly." The letter was "signed and sealed at Wittenberg, after the feast of St. Nicholas in the year 1539—Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, Martin Bucer, Anthony Corvin, Adam John Lening, Justin Wintfert, Dionysius Melanther."

In Michelet's Life of Luther (Bohn ed., p. 411), it is suggested that the following passage from the Table Talk "affords an explanation of the consultation in favor of the landgrave": "The secret marriages of princes and great lords are regular marriages before God, somewhat analogous with the concubinage of the patriarchs." Contrast the conduct and words of the so-called Reformer with those of Pope Clement VII. when obliged to deal with Henry VIII. of England in similar circumstances.

Not every Protestant writer has sanctioned Luther's advice to Philip of Hesse. Koestlin, a nineteenth-century apologist, calls the second marriage "not only the greatest scandal, but the greatest blot in the history of the Reformation and in the life of Luther" (Martin Luther, vol. II., p. 481). And Menzel writes: "The Protestant princes, rendered by the treaty of Augsburg unlimited dictators in matters of faith in their own territories, had lost all sense of shame. Philip of Hesse married two wives" (History of Germany, vol. II., p. 288). And Froude, who cannot be accused of partiality to things Catholic, wrote, some thirty-five years ago:

"Two generations ago the leading reformers were looked upon as little less than saints; now a party has risen up who intend, as they frankly tell us, to un-Protestantize the Church of England, who detest Protestantism as a kind of infidelity; who desire simply to reverse everything which the reformers did.

"One of these gentlemen, a clergyman, writing lately of Luther, called him a heretic, fit only to

be ranked with—whom do you think? Joe Smith, the Mormon prophet. Joe Smith and Luther,—that is the combination with which we are now presented" (Short Studies on Great Subjects, Scribner's ed., vol. I., p. 41).

Apropos, Mgr. O'Hare, in his recently published "Facts About Luther," recalls an episode which took place in the federal House of Representatives seventeen years ago. Opposition to Congressman Roberts of Utah crystallized around charges that he was a polygamist, and protests against him poured into the House from all parts of the country. Mr. Roberts, in a speech delivered January 29, 1900, thus paid his compliments to his opponents:

"Here, in the resident portion of this city, you erected, May 21, 1884, a magnificent statue of stern old Martin Luther, the founder of Protestant Christendom. You hail him as the apostle of liberty and the inaugurator of a new and prosperous era of civilization for mankind; but he himself sanctioned polygamy, with which I am charged." Mr. Roberts quoted passages from Luther's writings, which left no room for doubt (Cong. Record, vol. XXXIII., p. 1101). The comparison must have disconcerted his hearers, yet it was none the less true.

The Springs of Divorce

But the evil of Luther's teachings was not to stop with Luther's time. That they were the source whence sprang the terrible modern evil of divorce cannot be gainsaid. We have seen some of Luther's views on the necessity of marriage, and his admirers are wont to defend his insistence on this point by asserting that in his time morals in Germany were very loose. But, granting this, it was not necessary, by way of reform, to overturn the existing belief in matrimony as a sacrament. Luther, as in so many other cases, taught the civil nature of marriage in order to do away entirely, or at least essentially, with its spiritual aspect. "He maintained that marriage, as the basis of all family rights, lies entirely within the province of the state and must be regulated of necessity by the civil government. 'Marriage and the married state,' he declared, 'are civil matters, in the management of which we priests and

ministers of the Church must not intermeddle. But when we are required, either before the church, or in the church, to bless the pair, to pray over them, or even to marry them, then it is our bounden duty to do so'" (Luther Hess Waring, The Political Theories of Martin Luther, p. 222). Dr. Waring wrote this work seven years ago, and is an out-and-out admirer of the German heresiarch.

Appeals to the Civil Power

The statement that marriage "lies entirely within the province of the state" is an assertion of that supremacy of secular governments in religious affairs which has ever been characteristic of Protestantism. And, as such, it brings us back again to the suppression of the peasants' revolt,—an event which "marked the turning-point of the Reformation on the Continent." In other words, it established definitely the idea of subordination of Church to State. Schisms had arisen as the natural result of Luther's own teaching. Zwingli, the Swiss "reformer," supporting Luther's old opponent Carlstadt, denied the dogma of the Real Presence. Luther had rejected transubstantiation for consubstantiation, which meant the presence of Christ's Body "in, with, and under the bread." The substance as well as the accidents of bread remained after the consecration. Needless to say, this view is not in accord with Catholic teaching; but it is far from approaching Zwingli's flat negation. The dispute between the pair grew more acrimonious with the passing of the years. Other sects, too, gained some strength; e. g., the Anabaptists. Long before this, however, Luther, acting on the precedent established by himself in calling on the princes to crush the peasants' revolt, had invoked the aid of the secular arm to control the results of private judgment. The following passage from Professor Philippson's Age of the Reformation (Wright's translation, p. 106), is illuminating not only in this regard, but because it shows the deplorable consequences of the new doctrines:

"In November, 1526, Luther applied for the first time to Elector John to put an end to the insufferable confusion in church and school by means of a 'sovereign visitation,' and to subject

religious institutions to a uniform law. Certainly this had become necessary. Release from confession and penance, and from all church discipline such as had prevailed under the old system, and the idea that faith alone saves, while 'good works' are almost useless accompaniments, had, among the adherents of the new doctrine, encouraged an unbridled immorality."

The Diet of Speyer (1526)

In the years which followed Luther's marriage and his disagreement with Zwingli, several efforts were made to heal the religious troubles in Germany. A Diet was convoked at Speyer in 1526, at which it was decided that each state should comply with the Edict of Worms as its prince would answer to God and the Emperor,—in other words, that every prince might, as he pleased, enforce or disregard that edict. At Nuremberg it had been decreed that the Edict of Worms was to be observed "as far as possible"; hence the settlement at Worms had a sort of precedent in the former Diet. This settlement was to be effective until a general or national council should be convened. The important point to be noted is, that its terms were relatively favorable to the religious innovators. Professor Philippson's remarks on the Diet's decision are interesting:

"This became the decisive formula for the further religio-political development of Germany. . . . For the first time the division was recognized by the tribunal of the empire; it was an important fact that the choice of Lutheranism or Catholicism was left, not to the individual subject, but to the prince. This was the first realization of the doctrine that for two centuries prevailed in Germany—'cujus regio, ejus religio.' From this time dates the official sanction of that division in the church which was so harmful to Germany; but at the same time the Lutheran church had secured legal ground on which to grow and develop freely. This development was bound up with the victory of the territorial princes over all efforts at unity, over the robber-knights, and over democracy. It was natural, and we cannot blame the Reformation for it, that the church authority, wrested from Pope and bishops,

was transferred to princes and magistrates" (op. cit., pp. 105-6). He adds that the Lutheran clergy soon became intolerant, and that Luther himself sanctioned persecutions.

The Diet of Speyer (1529)

Another noteworthy attempt to solve the burning question was made in a new Diet assembled at Speyer, by order of the emperor's brother Ferdinand, in 1529. Here the Lutheran principalities represented in the Diet were permitted to practice their religion within their territorial limits, and the same principle was recognized as applicable to the Catholic Estates. Although Melancthon, who was present, accepted the arrangement, some of the Lutheran princes refused to do so, and drew up a protest from which was derived the generic name "Protestant" now in common use. The division mentioned by Philippson as receiving a quasi-sanction at the former Diet of Speyer became a reality in the later one.

The Augsburg Confession

The negotiations, then, had been barren of good results. The quarrel between Luther and Zwingli was raging as furiously as ever, so Landgrave Philip, hoping to reconcile the two, negotiated a meeting and a disputation in the fall of 1529. But the encounter only widened the gulf. Charles V. now took matters into his own hands, and summoned the Diet of Augsburg, which met in April, 1530. Luther, being under ban, could not appear, but was represented by Melancthon, who drew up a Lutheran profession of faith. This is called the Augsburg Confession. It consists of two parts, the first of which sets forth, in twenty-one articles, the creed of the "Reformer's" party. The second part names in seven articles the "abuses" of Rome, to-wit, (1) Communion under one kind, (2) the celibacy of the clergy, (3) the Mass, (4) obligatory auricular confession, (5) feasts and fasts, (6) monastc vows, (7) the secular power of bishops. The Diet, while willing to recognize the existence of real abuses, rejected those alleged by Melancthon and confined itself to a consideration of the first part of the Confession, of which it approved eighteen articles either unreservedly, or with certain qualifications or

amendments. The three entirely condemned were those on the Church, on faith and good works, and on the Invocation of the Saints. To many of the articles Melancthon's skilful hand had given a decidedly Catholic touch.

The reply of the Catholic theologians (among whom was Eck) was read after a softening process commanded by the Emperor. Melancthon in turn answered the theologians' "Confutation," but his statements were not acceptable to Charles, and here the proceedings came to a hitch.

The tenth article of the first part of the Augsburg Confession, which was approved on condition that the Real Presence of Christ be wholly admitted under either species—

> Caro cibus, sanguis potus:
> Manet tamen Christus totus
> Sub utraque specie—

brings to mind Luther's view of the Mass, which, as a sacrifice, was declared to be an abuse in the third article of the second part. In 1526, Luther had said: "The Mass is the principal service ordained for the consolation of true Christians." The Canon indeed was omitted from Luther's "German Mass," but the externals were retained—vestments, candles, ceremonies, etc., because, as Melancthon said, the common folk "so adhered to the Mass that nobody could take it from them." "Thus," remarks Bishop Stang, "the people could not perceive the depth of the chasm that separated the new worship from the old" (Luther, p. 75). Doubtless Luther's willingness to keep up appearances widened the breach between him and his reforming opponents. But we must return to the Diet.

Zwingli's Confession

Zwingli's confession of faith was presented on July 8, and the so-called Tetrapolitan Confession was sent to the Diet three days later. This was so-called because it "represented the faith of four imperial cities, Strassburg, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau, which at that time sympathized with Zwingli . . . rather than with Luther, on the doctrine of the sacraments." Neither confession was read. The former argues at length against the Real Presence, takes issue with the

Anabaptists on their denial of the validity of the infant baptism, rejects the doctrine of Purgatory, teaches justification by faith, etc. It was a much more radical departure from the Catholic faith than Luther's. After Zwingli's death two "Helvetic Confessions" were drawn up, the first in 1536 and the second in 1566, embodying the articles of faith of his followers, who differed from Lutherans on the sacramental question. Continental Protestants are still accustomed to describe themselves as belonging to the Augsburg Confession or the Helvetic, as the case may be; but the rapid decay of Protestantism under the influence of the so-called "higher criticism" and the pronouncements of such men as Harnack has obliterated all differences but those of form.

Civil War Threatened

After the Diet had weighed the Augsburg Confession, the Emperor, on September 22, 1530, issued a decree unfavorable to the Lutheran claims, and gave the leaders a recess until April 15, 1531, to reconsider their views. The plan was spurned, and the so-called Schmalkaldic League—an alliance of all Lutherans—was formed in March. The Catholic princes had already organized the Catholic League. The Schmalkaldic leaders determined to take up arms, and to that end bargained with Francis I., King of France, and with Henry VIII. of England. The latter prince was now busy about his divorce proceedings, and had little time for German affairs. Yet, when there was a prospect that Luther might win Henry to his new faith, he wrote to the man whom a few years before he had called "a crowned ass," "a liar," "an idiot," etc., these fawning words: "I should indeed fear to address your Majesty when I remember how I insulted you in the pamphlet which I, a proud and vain man, yielding to evil advisers and not to my own inclinations, published against you. I hardly dare lift my eyes to you; I, a worm of dust and rottenness deserving merely contempt and disdain, who have not feared to insult so great a prince." Henry was seeking the opinions of the universities to justify his divorce, and an agent had presented his case to Wittenberg. But, though Melancthon and Luther gave their views, Henry paid little atten-

tion, nor did he show any enthusiasm for the Lutheran league against the Emperor. Civil war in Germany was in the end averted through fear of the Turks.

Invitation to a General Council

Pope Clement VII. died September 25, 1534, and his successor, Paul III. made another attempt to convene an Ecumenical Council. The Protestants, following Luther, were always appealing to a general synod, but now, when Paul's legate came to Germany with invitations to assemble at Mantua, they flatly refused to attend. "Herein," remarks Ganss, "we have the first public and positive renunciation of the Papacy." Instead, Luther proposed to summon a Protestant national council, and to that end drew up the "Articles of Schmalkald," in which he rejected many of the doctrines retained in the Augsburg Confession. But the proposed national council was never held.

XIII.

How the Reformation Spread

The "Articles of Schmalkald" were published in 1537. Three years of warfare between Charles V. and the King of France had favored the religious innovators by drawing elsewhither the attention of the Emperor; but this notwithstanding, there was little harmony among the Protestant leaders. In 1536 Martin Bucer, on whom Zwingli's mantle had fallen, had tried to unite his own party and the Lutherans, and for a brief time he seemed to have succeeded. But his short-lived peace was illusory. Luther himself never really recognized the "Concord of Wittenberg," and without his favor there could be no hope of agreement.

Meanwhile the Schmalkaldic League had added to its membership. New princes and cities sought admission, and by doing so, emphasized the political character of the Reformation. The "cujus regio, ejus religio" was now the all-controlling factor in the spread of the new religion. Potentates settled off-hand ecclesiastical problems to suit themselves. For instance, the Elector John Frederick of Saxony used force to install the Lutheran Nicholas Amsdorf in the vacant see of Naumburg-Zeitz, the chapter of the cathedral having already lawfully chosen its provost, Julius von Pflug. In 1539 Duke George of Saxony, one of Luther's most determined opponents, died without issue, and was succeeded by his brother Henry, a thoroughgoing Lutheran. Aided by Melancthon, the new duke lost no time in Protestantizing his domain, and so ducal Saxony joined electoral Saxony as a stronghold of Lutheranism.

Still other states were won in much the same manner. The Catholic Joachim I., Elector of Brandenburg (the nucleus of the present kingdom of Prussia), died. His younger son John, Margrave of Kuestrin, at once declared himself a Protestant, whilst his elder brother Joachim II., who succeeded to the electorate, followed cautiously in John's steps, and likewise received the support of Melancthon. In 1542 Duke Henry of

Brunswick, an opponent of the new order, was driven from his territory, and the "reformed" creed was forcibly introduced. All northern Germany was now Lutheranized. Yet the collapse of the Schmalkaldic League a year after Luther's death enabled Bishop von Pflug and Henry of Brunswick to recover their rights, whilst the resignation of Hermann von Wied as Archbishop of Cologne checked the progress of the Reformation along that part of the Rhine.

The Emperor's Hopes Frustrated. Luther's Death

Here, however, we have anticipated somewhat. Even after the failure of Bucer's plans in 1536, Charles V. still entertained hopes that the factions might unite, whereupon negotiations could be opened with a view of bringing them back to the old Church. In 1540 he was especially sanguine, yet he was again doomed to disappointment. After several preliminary colloquies, the problem was referred to the Diet of Ratisbon, where Contarini, the legate of Pope Paul III., earnestly seconded the imperial wish. But the Elector John Frederick of Saxony and King Francis I. of France, both scheming to diminish the Emperor's power, threw every obstacle in the way of reconciliation. The elector even placed Melancthon, who was thought to favor reunion, under strict surveillance. And finally Luther himself intervened to prevent so much as an armistice.

The work of spreading the Reformation then went on as already described. Luther's life, however, was now drawing to a close. The separation from Rome of much of northern Europe was an accomplished fact. Henry VIII. had dragged England into schism, France was trembling in the balance, Switzerland was in a state of chaos. Though Luther was resposible for it, there was nothing in the condition of Germany to make him happy. "We live in Sodom and Babylon," he wailed; "things are rapidly growing worse." Nevertheless he raved as violently as ever against the Papacy, and continued to do so until the end. In the early morning hours of February 18, 1546, in his sixty-third year, the hierophant of the German Reformation went to render his last account to a Judge who sees and knows all things.

The Reformation in Switzerland: Zwingli

Before proceeding with the course of events in Germany after Luther's death, we will retrace our steps to learn something about Luther's chief sectarian opponent, and the preaching of his doctrines in Switzerland. Ulrich Zwingli was born January 1, 1484, and studied variously at Basle, Berne, and Vienna. He was an ardent Humanist. As pastor of the town of Glarus he devoted himself to study, teaching, and correspondence with Erasmus and other Humanists of the day. He left Glarus in 1516 to preach (although a secular priest) at the famous Benedictine monastery of Einsiedeln. He had zealously defended the Papal cause against a French party in Switzerland, and was given a small annual pension by Leo X. Whilst at Einsiedeln, Zwingli vigorously supported the attacks of Erasmus on the abuses of the day.

On the first of January, 1519, Zwingli made his appearance as a preacher in the cathedral at Zurich. The chapter had selected him for that post, although he had been charged with grave moral delinquencies, which, by his own confession, were not fictitious. He was also too much devoted to political matters. Yet he had not as yet given signs of disloyalty to the Holy See.

It cannot be denied that affairs ecclestiastical were open, in Switzerland, to serious reproach. Neither can it be gainsaid that the fact was fully recognized by many of the bishops and clergy. One in particular, Hugo von Hohenlandenberg, Bishop of Constance, made strenuous efforts to reform his diocese, but the civil authorities would not co-operate, and certain unfortunate privileges which they had acquired, added to his difficulties and to those of his fellow bishops. Then, too, the mercenary military system, by which the services of Swiss soldiers were secured for other countries, had led to foreign intrigue and partisanship on Swiss soil. France, for instance, was trying to thwart the desire of Pope Leo X. to engage troops. This mercenary system was attacked by Zwingli, who prevented the Canton of Zurich from entering into alliance with France in 1521. Such a success naturally increased his political prestige.

Zwingli's First Attack

It was in 1522 that Zwingli made his bow as a "reformer" by an attack on the law of fasting. In the same year he joined in a petition to the Bishop of Constance to allow priests to marry. His moral lapses were frequent; indeed, such lapses are specifically alleged as a reason for the petition. Two years later, if we may anticipate, Zwingli married one Anna Reinhard, a widow. Indeed, he seems to have been dominated by his passions, and it is a curious commentary on the merits of these so-called reformers that they are found, by their own writings, to have been downright profligates.

To return to 1522. Zwingli, in defense of his attack on fasting, asserted that the Bible was the sole rule of faith, and thereby identified himself in a measure with the religious innovators in Germany. Bishop Hugo now exhorted obedience, and Pope Adrian VI. by a personal message tried to dissuade Zwingli from the course on which he was bent; but all in vain. Public disputations followed. Zwingli brought forth sixty-seven articles, which contained his declaration of faith. In 1524-5 he gave effect to his creed by abolishing the sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction, denouncing indulgences, prohibiting pilgrimages, condemning clerical celibacy, etc. He taught that there were no ecclesiastical dignitaries, and that Christ's teaching recognized secular authority alone. He did not subscribe to Luther's dogma of faith without good works, but held, on the contrary, that man must seek to overcome sin by his own efforts.

The Eucharistic Controversy

Mention has already been made of the difference between Luther's teaching and that of Zwingli in reference to the Eucharist. Here, perhaps, we may set forth briefly all the contending views of this great doctrine held by the leading heresiarchs. To Luther's theory of consubstantiation Zwingli opposed a purely figurative interpretation of the words of Christ, "This is My Body," holding that "is" means only "signifies." Œcolampadius a little later "shifted the metaphor" to the word "Body," thus reaching a conclusion practically the same as Zwingli's. Still

later, Calvin sought a course between those of Luther and Zwingli when he professed to find, instead "of the substantial presence in one case and the merely symbolical in the other, a certain mean, i. e., 'dynamic,' presence, which consists essentially in this, that, at the moment of reception, the efficacy of Christ's Body and Blood is communicated from heaven to the souls of the predestined, and spiritually nourishes them. Thanks to Melancthon's pernicious and dishonest double-dealing, this attractive intermediary position of Calvin made such an impression even in Lutheran circles that it was not until the Formula of Concord in 1577 that the 'crypto-Calvinistic' venom was successfully rejected from the body of Lutheran doctrine. The Council of Trent met these widely divergent errors of the Reformation with the dogmatic definition that the God-man is 'truly, really, and substantially' present under the appearances of bread and wine, purposely intending thereby to oppose the expression **vere** to Zwingli's **signum, realiter** to Œcolampadius's **figura** and **essentialiter** to Calvin's **virtus** (Sess. XXII., can. i). And this teaching of the Council of Trent has ever been and is now the unwavering position of the whole of Catholic Christendom" (Pohle, Cath. Encyc., vol. V., p. 577).

Zwingli's "Tolerance"

Theoretically, Zwingli was more tolerant than Luther. His sixty-fifth article contained the following words: "As for those who will not come to the truth, God will judge them. No man, therefore, should do them violence." "Zwingli," remarks Philippson, "was thus the first theologian who taught practical liberty of conscience" (Age of the Reformation, p. 126), an honor which another Protestant, Waring, claims for Luther (Political Theories of Martin Luther, page 256). In practice, however, Zwingli was not tolerant. At his instigation altars, statues, organs, and pictures were ruthlessly destroyed, chalices melted to be turned into coin, and churches and monastic properties seized by the civil power—always the beneficiary of the Reformation. Dr. Philippson's statement has no foundation in the case of Zwingli himself, and its inference that no one be-

fore Zwingli ever taught "practical liberty of conscience" is equally misleading. Whilst the Church has always defended the truth committed to her guardianship, she has also been mindful of the requirements of Christian charity. One instance will suffice to illustrate the point. On April 6, 1233, Pope Gregory IX. addressed a Brief to the French Bishops concerning the attitude of Christians toward Jews: "Est autem Judaeis a Christianis exhibenda benignitas, quam Christianis in Paganismo existentibus cupimus exhiberi—The benignity which we wish to be borne to Christians in pagan lands is also to be displayed by Christians towards Jews." As Dr. Pohle remarks (Cath. Encyc., vol. XII., p. 764), this means that "whoever claims tolerance must likewise show tolerance."

Dissension

As with Luther, so with Zwingli. His own followers began to quarrel amongst themselves. He had laid down the principle that the Bible was the sole rule of faith, and the peasants, declaring that the Bible did not justify the payment of taxes, refused to contribute to the support of their lords. Then, too, the Anabaptists drew many of their peculiar tenets from applications of the same principle. Dr. Philippson truly remarks that "in Switzerland, as in Germany, division and discord followed the Reformation." And, by-the-way, Zwingli's treatment of the Anabaptists is another disproof of his alleged spirit of tolerance. He persecuted them with all the means at his command; exile, torture, and death were meted out mercilessly. As we shall see a little later, however, the Anabaptists were even more violent when they themselves had the power, so there is no particular reason for wasting sympathy on them.

In the midst of these troubles, the "Forest Cantons" —Schwyz, Uri, Unterwalden, Lucerne, and Zug—remained faithful to the Church. Ultimately the cantons of Thurgau, Bern, Basle, Schaffhausen, and Zurich, with St. Gall and Graubunden (Grisons), went over to Zwingli. Bern, Zurich, and the imperial city of Constance formed an alliance to defend the Reformation.

Incipient Hostilities

Zwingli now planned to weaken the political power of the Catholic cantons. They retaliated by organizing a league "for the Protection of the Faith," and obtaining the support of Austria. Philippson writes: "Hostilities broke out first in Aargau, where Zurich had been carrying on the Reformation with a high hand; but the Confederates were reluctant to shed each other's blood, and the neutral cantons brought about the first Peace of Cappel, which was so far favorable to Zurich, that it enjoined the Forest Cantons to dissolve their alliance with Austria (June, 1529). It was a victory for the Reformation and for Zurich, but Zurich speedily abused it. Whilst forcing upon their subjects the reformed faith—in violation of Zwingli's own principles—they summoned the five cantons to permit in their territory the free preaching of the Gospel, a most unwarranted request, considering that the people of the five cantons were unanimous in their adherence to the old faith" (op, cit., p. 127).

Zwinglian Violence

The dispute of Zwingli with Luther regarding the Eucharist has already been dealt with, and the views of the two set forth. Luther's violence in that debate caused several cities in southwestern Germany to go over to Zwingli, who had sought reconciliation with him and Melancthon. But both, hoping to gain concessions from the Imperial Diet, the members of which were for the most part hostile to the Swiss, rejected all of Zwingli's advances. So the Swiss heresiarch devoted his attention to the establishment of new alliances, and when all was ready, gave a new exhibition of his views of "liberty of conscience." Since Dr. Philippson bestowed the undeserved encomium, he will be allowed to tell the story:

"With unjustifiable violence Zwingli and the people of Zurich now joined the non-Catholic subjects of the Abbot of St. Gall in driving their master out of his possessions, set up a democratic government, and proceeded to introduce the Reformation (1530). . . . Justly incensed at this lawless proceeding, the five Catholic cantons came together to provide for their safety. Had Zurich waited to be attacked, it would un-

doubtedly have received assistance from the other reformed cantons. But it chose to assume the offensive. By the so-called 'Food Blockade,' Zurich deprived (May, 1531) of food the five cantons whose barren mountains could not produce food enough. Zwingli expressed himself clearly: 'peace could not be secured, till the five cantons were humbled and deprived of their leading position in the Confederacy.' When the five cantons, tired of continuous attacks, threatened to march on Zurich if the Abbot of St. Gall was not recalled and the food blockade raised, distrust, resulting from a consciousness of the injustice of their cause, took possession of the majority of the men of Zurich. Only 2000 of them marched out to encounter 8000 confederates. Near the frontier of the canton at Cappel this handful was easily routed by the fierce mountaineers, and a large number of them were slain (October 11, 1531)." Zwingli himself fell in the battle, and, although others tried to assume the leadership, his teachings were checked, the Catholics regained some of their lost ground, and even in Zurich there was a marked reaction against the political control of the Zwinglians. Nevertheless, the net result of Zwingli's career was to make German-speaking Switzerland largely Protestant, and largely Protestant it remains. The Reformation in French-speaking Switzerland will be dealt with later.

Œcolampadius

Another Swiss "reformer" who must not be forgotten was John Œcolampadius, as his family name, Heussgen, was hellenized after the fashions of the time. Born in 1482, he too was educated along Humanistic lines, and was, like Zwingli, a correspondent of Erasmus. For a time he was a preacher in the cathedral of Basle, and then in that of Augsburg.

In 1520 he sent confidentially to Bernhard Adelmann of Augsburg a written statement favorable to Luther, which the recipient, ignoring the sender's wish, published at once. Confession and the sacrificial character of the Eucharist were attacked in the following year. He was now on the same doctrinal road travelled by the other leaders of the Reformation. Luther's doctrine of justification by faith alone was defended by him,

and, like his fellows, he urged the marriage of priests. But the Council of the city of Basle for a time held him in check.

In 1525 Œcolampadius entered the Eucharistic controversy with views akin to those of Zwingli. Up to this time he had continued to say Mass, but in November he drew up a form of service in keeping with his heretical ideas. In May, 1527, he represented the Protestants of Basle when requested, as were all the clergy in the city, to declare his views of the Mass. The Council then decided to allow each one the right to reject or retain the Mass, and this act saved for the moment the churches whose congregations remained Catholic. But all the monasteries in Basle were suppressed.

After the sacking of several churches in the spring of 1528, the followers of Œcolampadius demanded that the Council definitely forbid the Mass. Without waiting for a decision, they took the matter into their own hands, plundered the cathedral and the remaining Catholic churches, and banished the Catholic members of the Council. Œcolampadius himself played a large part in forcing through that body the edict which turned the city over to the Reformation. Catholic worship was entirely forbidden, and the people were by law compelled to take part in the new rites, or suffer banishment. In this manner, which suggests nothing whatever of tolerance or charity, Basle became one of the centers of the Reformation. Œcolampadius, after taking an active part in forcing the acceptance of the Reformation elsewhere, died in Basle in November, 1531.

The Anabaptists

We have had occasion, in several places, to mention the Anabaptists, whose denial of the validity of infant baptism was their distinctive teaching. At the time of the Reformation this view was first advanced by the "Prophets of Zwickau," whose violence at Wittenberg we have already noted. Their anarchistic doctrines had much to do with the Peasants' War. One of the "prophets," Thomas Muenzer, associated himself with an apostate monk named Pfeifer, and gained control of the city of Muehlhausen in Thuringia. Both were executed after the collapse of the

peasants' uprising, and the former, before his death, was reconciled with the Church. Neither the Peasants' War nor Zwingli's persecutions in Switzerland, however, seriously injured the new sect. It spread to some extent in a number of places in northern Europe. Among its wild doctrines was one to the effect that direct revelations of God to the individual were the only true source of authority.

Their Proceedings at Muenster

It was in the Westphalian city of Muenster that the utter fanaticism of the Anabaptists was startlingly displayed. A young chaplain, Bernard Rottmann, or Rothmann, had been preaching Lutheranism there. Luther advised him by letter to be on his guard against the Zwinglians; but Rottmann, although at first opposed to them, afterwards joined their ranks and gave his sympathy to the Anabaptists. Luther's utterances seem to have influenced this step, for Rottmann wrote, in the Pentecost season of 1533, that he could not describe "how the Lutherans threaten us." He was a thorough fanatic. In the presence of a crowd he threw a Host on the ground, saying: "Look you, where is the flesh and blood in that? If that were God, He would pick Himself up, and return to the altar." Rottmann had as an associate a cloth-merchant named Knipperdolling, and the two prepared the way, so to speak, for what was to come. We will hear the Protestant Professor Hagenbach of Basle tell the story:

"On the 14th of January, 1534, two apostles of the sect made their appearance in Muenster. These were John Bockhold (Bockelsohn, Benkelszoon), a tailor of Leyden, and John Matthias (Matthiesen, Matthyszoon), a baker of Haarlem, the latter of whom declared himself to be Enoch. Under the influence of these demagogues, fanaticism reached a dangerous height. They found a confederate in Bernard Knipperdolling, a cloth dealer: originally of Muenster, he had some time before been banished from the city, had made the acquaintance of the new prophets during his wanderings, and now cast in his lot with them, with the intention of establishing a new Jerusalem. These men usurped the civil authority.

Knipperdolling became first burgomaster, and another fanatic obtained the position of second burgomaster. A reign of terror now ensued, in which the wildest fanaticism displayed at once its most appalling and most ludicrous forms. A community of goods was immediately proclaimed. All in Muenster who possessed silver, gold, jewels, or works of art, were commanded, on pain of death, to deliver them up at the City Hall. Pictures and musical instruments were ruthlessly destroyed. Every man was ordered to work for the community, and common meals were instituted, as in Sparta, for the purpose of uniting all into one family.

"People of wealth who were able to leave the city at this time, took their departure, and those who did not voluntarily go were forcibly expelled. Anabaptism, though only in the limited area of a city government, succeeded in obtaining the prerogatives of an exclusive state religion, thereby presenting the most repulsive caricature of that theocratic ideal which hovered before the minds of the nobler natures of that age. Its rule was, fortunately, not of long duration. The prince-bishop besieged the apostate city. But in this very time of siege, fanaticism attained its acme. After the death of Matthiesen in a sally of the besieged, John of Leyden exercised unlimited authority as king. He was supported by twelve elders, in the character of the elders of the twelve tribes of Israel. Knipperdolling discharged the office of executioner. By his hand fell all who opposed the regulations of this new kingdom of God. A community of wives was forcibly established. The king himself had a harem containing sixteen women. In October, 1534, the whole city celebrated a great love-feast, at which places for 4200 persons were made ready. . . . During the feast, the king, who walked up and down among the long tables, espied an interloper in the person of one of the German lanzknechts, who had been taken prisoner, and had been brought to the entertainment by his host. The king, declaring that this unfortunate man 'had not on a wedding garment,' himself struck off his head in the presence of the whole assembly" (Moore's trans. of Hagenbach's History of the Reformation, Vol. II., pp. 217-9).

Another example of the same fanatical spirit, later in the siege when famine began to tell on the defenders, is related by Dr. Hagenbach: "When . . . one of the king's wives uttered a doubt as to whether it could be the will of God that the people should die of hunger while the king revelled in luxury, the king seized her, dragged her to the market-place in the midst of the assembled people, caused her to kneel, and with his own hand struck off her head; then, spurning the headless trunk with his foot, he forced the rest of his wives to sing, 'Glory be to God on high'" (Ibid. p. 220).

Such were some of the fruits of private judgment, and of the doctrine that declared the Bible, privately interpreted, to be the sole rule of faith'

XIV.

The Wars of Charles V.

The Emperor Charles V., in the course of his long reign, engaged in no less than four wars against Francis I. of France. An incident of the earlier struggles was the sack of Rome in 1527, when the city fell into the hands of Charles' motley horde of German, Italian, and Spanish troops. At the long last the Emperor, though making sundry concessions, gained decided advantages, especially by the Peace of Crespy (1544). It has already been stated that the distraction of war was, on the whole, decidedly advantageous to the Lutherans, since efforts for peace were always frustrated through fear of foreign complications; but now, with the external troubles out of the way, Charles decided to try, once more, to restore religious tranquillity to the sorely tried German people.

Meantime Pope Paul III. had summoned the long looked-for General Council, which met in Trent in March, 1545. The adherents of the Schmalkaldic League vehemently scouted the papal invitation, and, indeed, treated the imperial summons to a meeting at Ratisbon quite as contemptuously. But Charles, determinted to restore order, prevailed upon Duke Maurice of Saxony (who had succeeded his father Henry in 1541) to abstain from activities in behalf of the League. He then outlawed the Elector John Frederick of Saxony and the much-married Landgrave Philip of Hesse; and the League replied with war. The imperial commander, the Duke of Alva, by skillful tactics gained possession of a number of important places, whereupon Maurice of Saxony, espousing the imperial cause, overran the territories of the Elector John Frederick. The latter, however, unexpectedly rallied, and turned the tables on Maurice. But the Emperor, hastening to the aid of his ally, defeated and captured the Elector at Muehlberg, April 24, 1547. The Landgrave Philip then submitted, and the Schmalkaldic League collapsed.

The Augsburg Interim

The Council of Trent was already at work, and

the Emperor proceeded to instruct it in certain particulars which did not meet with the approval of the Pope. In his anger at Paul's refusal to do his bidding, Charles not only invaded the Papal States, but published, in the Diet assembled at Augsburg in 1548, a temporary scheme of religious union known as the "Augsburg Interim." It was intended to be effective until the General Council could settle the points at issue; but it was a most unwarrantable interference with ecclesiastical rights, since it proposed to allow the laity to receive Holy Communion under both species, and the clergy to marry. Moreover, it was dangerously near heresy in several particulars, notably on the doctrine of the Eucharist. It also seemed to approve, in a measure, Luther's theory of justification by faith. The Pope was thoroughly alive to the danger threatening the freedom of the Church if Charles were allowed a complete victory over his enemies in Germany. Therefore, besides improving his strained relations with the King of France, Paul ordered the Council to quit Trent for Bologna. But some of the German bishops refused to go to Italy, and thus, for a time, the Council was unable to proceed with its work.

Every Catholic will understand that the "Interim" was nothing else than a usurpation, by Charles, of powers which certainly were not his. Yet not a few non-Catholic writers would have us believe that the Emperor was quite within his rights in thus acting "for peace." For instance, Dr. Fisher, sometime professor of ecclesiastical history in Yale, thought that the imperial "changes were proposed" only "in points of external order," though "the measures undertaken were . . . considered by the Pope and by zealous Catholics to be an encroachment upon his spiritual authority" (The Reformation, pp. 164-5). Dr. Fisher was a Protestant clergyman, and it is quite evident from his words that he saw nothing incongruous in the formulation of religious decrees by a temporal prince.

The Treason of Maurice of Saxony

But it was not only the Pope who condemned the Interim. Inconsistently enough, many of the Lutheran rulers were also dissatisfied with the

Emperor's attempted dictation, and took steps to oppose it. Maurice, who had become Elector of Saxony, was appointed to see that it was carried out; but, because of sundry grievances against the Emperor, he had earlier entered into a secret alliance with Protestant princes, and when the city of Magdeburg resisted the Interim in a bloody revolt, the Duke's duplicity found an opportunity. Instead of using his troops to suppress the uprising, he made an offensive treaty with King Henry II. of France, who had succeeded Francis I., March 31, 1547. By the terms of the treaty Henry was bound to give direct aid to the Protestant princes of Germany, receiving, by way of compensation, the bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun. The war which followed was waged ferociously. Vast territories were devastated and the traitors plundered religious institutions everywhere. It must be said, however, that many Protestants, angered at the incursion of foreign troops at the behest of German princes, loyally supported Charles V. against the treachery of his liegemen. Bad though his attempt to enforce the Interim undoubtedly was, it could not justify wholesale treason.

Both Henry II. and the German princes had made treaties with the Turks, who took advantage of the war to conquer Hungary. Yet Charles remained in ignorance of the treacherous conduct of Maurice until the Elector himself suddenly invaded the Tyrol, and drove the Emperor from Innsbruck. Charles' brother Ferdinand thereafter carried on the war in his behalf, and, having inflicted a severe defeat on the rebels, offered to obtain a free discussion of peace in a general diet. Maurice accepted on condition of equality of rights with the Catholic princes who had been loyal to the Emperor, and to this Ferdinand agreed. The resulting amnesty was the so-called Truce of Passau. Before the diet met, however, Charles, with the aid of Albert of Brandenburg, ("The Burner"), an ally of Henry II. whom he won over by a somewhat abject stipulation, undertook a war against France to recover the lost bishoprics. The effort had a disastrous issue. Thereupon the Emperor broke with Albert, who, however, continued to fight until he was defeated by the forces of King Ferdinand and

Maurice of Saxony, the latter of whom fell in the battle. Ferdinand followed up his advantage, and soon was in possession of Albert's own territories.

The Religious Peace of Augsburg

Thus an uncertain peace was restored, and it became possible to summon the diet agreed upon in the Truce of Passau. Accordingly the princes assembled in Augsburg in February, 1555. The Emperor was not present, King Ferdinand presiding in his stead. Among other results of the diet, the Lutheran churches, by the "Religious Peace of Augsburg," "were expressly freed from episcopal jurisdiction;" Calvinists were excluded from all its terms; Catholics and Lutherans were declared to enjoy the same political rights; no estate was allowed to force its religion on another estate; the Church properties confiscated before the meeting of the Diet were to remain in the hands of the Lutherans; the spiritual authority of the Catholic bishops was annulled in the Lutheran estates, and those bishoprics filled by adherents of the new religion lost their spiritual dignities, revenues, and other temporalities. This last was the "Reservatum Ecclesiasticum," and it was bitterly opposed by all the Protestant estates save one. Yet, had their objections to it been allowed, there might have been great danger, through the connivance of hostile emperors or the use of force by unscrupulous princes, of finally Protestantizing all the German bishoprics. The Ecclestical Reservation was a guaranty, for the future, that the rights of the Catholic bishops would be respected.

The Peace of Augsburg was, in other particulars, thoroughly unsatisfactory. It established finally and definitely the "cujus regio, ejus religio," a principle which, as we have seen. had already been enforced, but which henceforward was the watchword of Protestant and Catholic princes alike. It is, however, a perversion of history to say, as do Philippson and other Protestant writers, that this vicious principle was established by the Catholic members of the Diet. The latter merely demanded, for the protection of the Church in their estates, such measures as seemed necessary, and their demands were not

half as numerous or insistent as were those of the Lutheran members. But, for all that, the Catholic princes acquiesced in the Diet's other decisions, lame and faulty though they were. It is hard to find a writer, Catholic or Protestant, who has a word of praise for the Religious Peace of Augsburg.

Its Effects

A. F. Pollard, a non-Catholic, writes:

"This lame and halting conclusion of nearly forty years' strife has been hailed as the birth of religious liberty; but it is mockery to describe the principle which underlay the Peace of Augsburg as one of toleration. 'Cujus regio ejus religio' is a maxim as fatal to true religion as it is to freedom of conscience; it is the creed of Erastian despotism, the formula in which the German territorial Princes expressed the fact that they had mastered the Church as well as the State. . . .

"The triumph of this principle is really the dominant note of the period. Territorialism ruined the Empire, captured the Reformation, crushed the municipal independence of the cities, and lowered the status of the peasant. . . .

"The 'Kaisertum' was but one of the Princes' victims; the 'Buergertum' also fell before them. The vigorous city life of the Middle Ages was a thing of the past; in many a German town the representative of the territorial sovereign domineered over the elect of the burghers, interfered in their administration, and even controlled their finances. On the shores of the Baltic the destruction of town independence involved the loss of Germany's maritime power, and not till our own day has this eclipse begun to pass. With the decay of civic life went also the ruin of municipal arts and civilization, and in its stead there was only the mainly formal culture of the petty German court. No age in Germany was more barren of intellectual inspiration than that which succeeded the Peace of Augsburg. The internecine struggles had exhausted all classes in the nation, and an era of universal lassitude followed: intellectually, morally, and politically, Germany was a desert, and it was called Religious Peace" (Cambridge Modern History, vol. II., pp. 277-9).

The Reformation and Liberty

Surely there is nothing in that account to justify the theory that the revolt of Luther and the others was undertaken in the hope of giving to mankind civil and religious liberty. Yet many writers imply this, and not a few explicitly state it. For instance, Dr. Waring, whom we have quoted before, and who may be taken as an exponent of the popular idea of the Reformation, says:

"In successfully protesting against worldly compulsion in matters of conscience, Luther was thus the first in Europe effectively to raise the banner of religious liberty. His teaching was a revelation in the field of European politics, as well as religious doctrine. It spread like wild-fire throughout the continent, and its influence is seen in the political literature of those countries already in the sixteenth century. . . . The Reformation emphasized the individual and individual rights and powers that cannot be properly or permanently controlled by the state" (Political Theories of Martin Luther, pp. 256-7).

The Judgment of Historians

Against such shallow statements can be produced a whole catena of judgments to the contrary, every one uttered by a non-Catholic. For example, Hallam writes:

"Whatever be the bias of our minds as to the truth of Luther's doctrines, we should be careful in considering the Reformation as a part of the history of mankind, not to be misled by the superficial and ungrounded representations which we sometimes find in modern writers. Such as this, that Luther, struck by the absurdity of the prevailing superstitions, was desirous of introducing a more rational system of religion; or that he contended for freedom of inquiry and the boundless privileges of individual judgment; or, what others have been pleased to suggest, that his zeal for learning and ancient philosophy led him to attack the ignorance of the monks, and the crafty policy of the Church, which withstood all liberal studies. These notions are merely fallacious refinements, as every man of plain understanding who is acquainted with the early reformers, or has considered their history, must acknowledge" (Intro-

duction to the History of Literature, Standard ed., vol. I., pp. 305-7.) In the same volume (p. 377) he declares that

"The adherents of the Church of Rome have never failed to cast two reproaches on those who left them: one that the reform was brought about by intemperate and calumnious abuse, by the outrages of an excited populace, or by the tyranny of princes; the other, that, stimulating the most ignorant to reject the authority of their Church, it instantly withdrew this liberty of judgment and devoted all who presumed to swerve from the line drawn by law, to virulent obloquy, and sometimes to bonds and death. These reproaches, it may be a shame to us to own, 'can be uttered, and cannot be refuted.'"

A recent Protestant author, Henry C. Vedder, says of the Peace of Augsburg:

"It is a mockery to describe this as the first public instrument that secured religious liberty. Religious liberty is an idea conspicuously absent from it—it does not even mention toleration save in the narrowest and most grudging form; the toleration of governments by each other, not the toleration of individuals by governments. It legalized the Erastian absolutism of the princes, probably the worst religious system ever devised by the wit of man" (The Reformation in Germany, p. 383).

Lord Acton, who, though a Catholic, was long under the "liberal" influence of Dr. Doellinger, writing of Luther's early appeal to the people against the civil power, and his later **volte face**, says:

"The Zwinglian schism, the rise of the Anabaptists, and the Peasants' War altered the aspect of affairs. Luther recognized in them the fruits of his theory of the right of private judgment and of dissent, and the moment had arrived to secure his Church against the application of the same dissolving principles which had served him to break off his allegiance to Rome. The excesses of the social war threatened to deprive the movement of the sympathy of the higher classes, especially of the governments; and with the defeat of the peasants the popular phase of the Reformation came to an end on the Continent. . . . He instantly turned from the

people to the princes; impressed on his party that character of political dependence, and that habit of passive obedience to the State, which it has ever since retained, and gave it a stability it could never otherwise have acquired. In thus taking refuge in the arms of the civil power, purchasing the safety of his doctrine by the sacrifice of its freedom, and conferring on the State, together with the right of control, the duty of imposing it at the point of the sword, Luther in reality reverted to his original teaching. The notion of liberty, whether civil or religious, was hateful to his despotic nature, and contrary to his interpretation of Scripture" (Essays on Liberty, p. 156).

In Other Lands

Dr. Waring and the other followers of traditional Protestant history have not consulted the best writers of their own household. If there is anything certain in this world, it is this: the "reformers" never intended to advance the cause of political liberty. Whilst on this subject, we may as well quote, albeit by anticipation, what Protestant authors have had to say about the character of the Reformation outside of Germany.

First, as to Norway, Denmark, and Sweden, Philippson writes: "Meanwhile, Lutheranism had taken root and was spreading rapidly among kinsmen of the Germans, the Scandinavians. . . . In the north it was the monarchical powers that, for purely interested ends, borrowed the Reformation from Germany and imposed it upon their subjects" (Age of the Reformation, p. 130).

Next, as to England, Cobbett says: "The Reformation, as it is called, was engendered in beastly lust, brought forth in hypocrisy and perfidy, and cherished and fed by plunder, devastation, and rivers of innocent English and Irish blood" (History of the Protestant Reformation, pp. 2-3).

Macaulay thus describes the leaders of the English revolt from Rome: "A king whose character may best be described by saying that he was despotism itself personified; unprincipled ministers; a rapacious aristocracy; a servile parliament. Such were the instruments by which England was delivered from the yoke of Rome" (Macaulay's Essays: On Hallam's Constitutional History).

Andrew Lang quotes Professor F. York Powell in regard to Scotland:

"The whole story of Scottish Reformation, hatched in purchased treason and outrageous intolerance, carried on in open rebellion and ruthless persecution, justified only in its indirect results, is perhaps as sordid and disgusting a story as the annals of any European country can show" (Fortnightly Review, vol. 74, p. 217).

To epitomize the whole argument: governmental tyranny has never yet gone hand in hand with popular liberty. History shows that the Reformation was always the ally of the former.

The Reformation and the German Universities

Another assertion often made is, that the Reformation was the **fons et origo** of popular education. As far as Germany is concerned, the assertion can be disposed of here.

In the first place, Luther had little respect for human reason. In 1535 he wrote: "Reason scorns God, denies His wisdom, justice, mercy; yes, His Godhead itself. It is always opposed to the true and the good; all its wisdom is only foolishness. In matters of faith it is utterly blind. It does not even rightly recognize and understand moral truths, even such as man's nature, so to speak, is born to . . . From its very nature it loses itself in pharisaic superstition; even on the transactions of daily life it cannot pronounce true judgment. It is the mother of all errors, the source of all that is bad, the plague of mankind" (Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians). Carducci, in his "Hymn to Satan," surely made a mistake when he placed the name of Luther and the "avenging force of human reason" in juxtaposition.

On the subject of philosophy Luther and Melancthon were not in harmony. For a time, indeed, the latter agreed with his master, and whilst under Luther's influence asserted that "philosophy taught at all points the opposite of truth" (Janssen, History of the German People, vol. xiv, p. 126). For the works of Aristotle Luther had the bitterest hatred—a fact which has endeared his memory to the shallow "scientific" paragraphers of our day. When the great Copernicus, who died three years before Luther,

published his epochal work "De Revolutionibus Orbium Cœlestium"—On the Revolution of the Heavenly Bodies—and thereby dealt the first and greatest blow to Ptolemy's system of geocentric astronomy, Luther called him a "fool" and an "upstart astrologer." Seek in what field we will, we cannot find evidence that Luther was an overzealous advocate of intellectual freedom.

This statement is borne out by the condition of the German universities after Luther broke away from the old faith. The conscientious and erudite Janssen says: "A natural result of these religious disturbances was a general and rapid decay of intellectual life.

"Within a few years the universities were observed to deteriorate with a rapidity as astonishing as it was lamentable; 'for the students,' so people complained in the year 1524, 'are no longer interested in serious studies; . . . they are degenerating into coarseness and immorality, and at the same time they declare that they are the messengers of new wisdom and the reformers of public life.'

"Luther had denounced the universities as dens of murderers, temples of Moloch, synagogues of corruption; in a sermon preached in the year 1521 . . . he had actually gone the length of saying that 'the universities were only worthy of being reduced to dust; nothing more hellish or devilish had ever appeared on the earth from the beginning of things, or ever would appear.'" These sentiments found an echo in a pamphlet of Melancthon: "Never anything more corrupt or godless been invented than the universities; not the Popes, but the devil himself was their originator" (Op. cit., vol iii., pp. 355-6). The effects of such utterances may be learned from authentic reports. In 1520, 311 students matriculated at Erfurt; in 1521 the number was 120, in 1522, 72, in 1523, 34. At Rostock the matriculations before the Reformation numbered about 300; in 1524 they were 38, and in 1525, 15.

"From Basle," says Janssen, "comes the following wail in 1524: 'The university is as though dead and buried. Empty are the chairs of the teachers, and empty the benches of the learners.' In the year 1522 only 29 new students were entered, and in 1526 only 5. In Heidelberg in the

year 1525 there were more professors than students. 'I have scarcely six regular attendants at my lectures,' wrote Ulrich Zasius, the most famous of all professors of law, from Freiburg in 1523, 'and these, moreover, are Frenchmen.'" The same condition prevailed in Vienna and elsewhere.

All this may be summed up in the following quotation from Janssen, supported as it is by the testimony of the apostate Doellinger: "Wherever the new doctrine could be preached without hindrance, multitudes of preachers worked deliberately for the overthrow of all scientific culture; they set about systematically to build on the ruins of ecclesiastical and educational institutions a government by the ignorant mob, under the leadership of clerical demagogues. They proceeded on the same principles which had been proclaimed in the fifteenth century by the Hussite party of the Taborites in Bohemia. 'Whoso studies the liberal arts,' they said, 'or graduates in them, is frivolous and heathenish, and a sinner against the Gospel. The "truths" of philosophy and of the liberal arts, even when they are in conformity with the laws of Christ, must not be studied, but set aside as heathenish, and the schools where they are taught must be destroyed'" (Op. cit., vol. iii., pp. 360-1).

XV.

The Reformation in Scandinavia

"In the north it was the monarchical powers that, for purely interested ends, borrowed the Reformation from Germany, and imposed it upon their subjects." Thus wrote the non-Catholic Professor Philippson, and we shall now see in what sense his words are true.

In 1397, by the vague terms of the Union of Kalmar, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark were united under one crown, the national institutions of each, however, being left intact. But the Union was never really a strong one. After the Count of Oldenburg ascended the Danish throne as Christian I. in 1448, he was successful in maintaining it for a time, but Sweden bolted his rule in 1471, and defeated his successor Hans in 1501, when the latter tried to assert his claims to the Swedish crown. Yet this notwithstanding, the Swedish "Rigsraad" in 1512 declared in favor of union with Denmark.

Nor was Norway much more loyal to the Union of Kalmar. Hans' son Christian had, however, reconquered the country for his father after a rebellion in 1502, and remained there as regent during a troubled period. On the death of Hans in 1513 he ascended the throne of Denmark as King Christian II. Two years later he married Isabella, sister of the future Emperor Charles V., an event which "obtained for him an influence in Europe such as no other King of Denmark had enjoyed."

The Reign of Christian II.

Sweden, in spite of the declarations of its Rigsraad, was not disposed to submit to his rule. It was not until November 4, 1520, that Christian donned the Swedish crown at Stockholm, and he disgraced himself four days later by an act of treachery which resulted in the execution, on charges of heresy, of ninety-four prominent men. Whilst acting ostensibly in the interests of the Church, it must be noted that he had already (1519) made overtures to the German Lutherans, and had obtained from Saxony a preacher named

Reinhard who, about the time of the Stockholm massacre, was expounding Lutheran doctrines in Copenhagen. Christian, whose nature was treacherous and cruel, was, in fact, nothing more than an opportunist. He would be Catholic or Lutheran as circumstances might demand.

Reinhard met with no success in Copenhagen, to which the king soon returned after further bloodshed in Sweden. The latter country now rose again him. The city of Luebeck also revolted, and Christian's maternal uncle, Duke Frederick of Schleswig-Holstein, was irritated because the king, in order to reduce him to a state of vassalage, had obtained from the Emperor Charles V. the rights of investiture of Frederick's duchies. Frederick therefore entered into an alliance with Luebeck, which city, assisted by the Hanseatic League, was now preparing for war against Christian.

The king, ignoring the bellicose intentions of his enemies, was meanwhile attempting to introduce ecclesiastical "reforms." He was **persona non grata** in Rome because he had caused the execution of three Swedish bishops, and besides, his new Danish code was certain, by its very nature, to bring him into further difficulties with the Pope. In Denmark, as elsewhere, there were doubtless abuses to be corrected; but such a work could not be successfully undertaken by the vindictive, harsh-mannered monarch whose acts earned for him the sobriquet, "Cruel." Christian's reign, however, was now rapidly nearing its end.

Frederick I. of Denmark

A fleet sent out by Luebeck ravaged the Danish coast and even laid siege to Copenhagen itself. The Swedes had already invaded the northern provinces, Frederick of Holstein entered the country from the south, the nobility and clergy of Jutland revolted, and Christian, overwhelmed by these results of his tyranny, fled from his capital in April 1523. His uncle was elected to fill the Danish throne, and acknowledged, in his recognition of Swedish independence, the political changes brought about by the revolt. Frederick I. also placated the Norwegians by formally acknowledging their right to elect their king, and

so won the Norwegian crown, although the people of that country undoubtedly preferred the exiled Christian.

As we have just seen, the deposed king's abortive attempt to introduce the new religion into Denmark had practically no results. But the outcome of the revolution against him promised greater success. In the first place, the nobility were the chief beneficiaries of that movement. "They secured exclusively the highest dignities in the Church, as well as the right of penal justice over their peasant subjects, thus sealing the servitude of the latter. Finally, all fiefs that had fallen to the crown by default were to be redistributed among the nobles" (Philippson, op. cit., p. 133).

It goes without saying that such a condition of affairs was injurious to the welfare of the Church. Our non-Catholic author remarks that "in his 'election agreement' at Viborg Frederick had promised not to introduce the Reformation into his dominions; but he made no opposition to its progress, and, indeed, secretly encouraged it. As early as 1525 his duchies of Schleswig and Holstein had become Lutheran, and he himself, next year, declared his allegiance to the new doctrine. His court became a centre for Lutheran theologians." The renewal, without satisfactory results to the king, of an old controversy over the long vacant archbishopric of Lund, to which Leo X. had injudiciously sought to appoint an Italian several years earlier, gave Frederick his opportunity to declare openly for Lutheranism in 1526.

How the Reformation Entered Denmark

Events now moved rapidly toward religious innovations. In Denmark, as elsewhere, one of the first acts of the Reformation was aimed at the celibacy of the clergy, when a decree allowing their marriage received the sanction of the Diet of Odense, which also, after the manner of the German diets, granted to the adherents of the old and new religions equal rights until a national council could be convened. From this same diet dates the earliest triumph of Lutheranism in Denmark. It is true that the hierarchy made strenuous efforts to prevent the spread of the Reformation, but Frederick frustrated their plans in a

characteristic way. When sees became vacant he handed them over to the nobles, and thus won the assent of the latter to his own plans.

In 1530 Frederick caused to be drawn up, by one Hans Taufen or Tausen, the "Danish Luther," forty-three articles setting forth the decrees of the Danish Evangelical Church. This act met with determined opposition from the clergy in both Denmark and Norway. The exiled Christian II., reconciled with the Holy See a year earlier, now saw an opportunity to recover his lost domains. In October, 1531, he landed in Norway, and the peasants rallied to his cause. But the wealthy city of Luebeck, which for political reasons had just embraced Lutheranism, came to Frederick's assistance, as did the Hanseatic League. Frederick was also able to call upon the German Lutheran princes for help, since he had just become a member of the Schmalkaldic League. Such an array of opponents convinced Christian that his cause was hopeless. He therefore agreed to an armistice, and obtained a safe-conduct to visit Frederick; but this was treacherously violated, and Christian spent twenty-seven years in confinement in Sonderburg Castle, where he died in 1559.

Frederick I. died in April, 1533. Under his successor, Christian III., the crown seized the church lands, and a diet assembled in Copenhagen in 1536 formally adopted the doctrines of the Reformation. At Odense, three years later, these proceedings were ratified. Yet it was a qualified form of Lutheranism that was forced upon Denmark. A quasi-episcopal establishment was authorized, but the apostolic succession was broken off when, in 1537, all the sees were filled with men consecrated by a Wittenberg preacher named John Bugenhagen, who certainly was not a bishop, even if he had (which is very doubtful) ever been ordained a priest.

The Triumph of the New Creed

The successor of Christian III. adopted a course characteristic of all the "reformers." "Frederick II. would allow of no dissent. The first who differed from the least of Luther's, or propounded new doctrines, 'Away with him!' was the cry" (T. Francis Bumpus, Cathedrals of Nor-

way, Sweden, and Denmark, p. 79). So Denmark, by a combination of the political acts of royalty and the greed of a tyrannical aristocracy, was robbed of her ancient faith, and is today, with Norway and Sweden, her neighbors, one of the most Protestant of lands. The census of 1911 showed a population of 2,775,076; the Catholics numbering only 9,821. Nevertheless, there is now for the adherents of all creeds complete political and religious liberty.

But it was not always so. Scandinavian Protestantism long held the people of the three kingdoms in what was little better than abject servitude, their venal parliaments having bestowed upon their sovereigns all rights and jurisdiction in civil and religious affairs alike. Viscount Molesworth, who was the representative of William III. of England at the Danish court, wrote in 1692: "In the Roman Catholic religion there is a resisting principle to absolute civil power, from the division of authority with the head of the Church of Rome; but in the North the Lutheran Church is entirely subservient to the civil power, and the whole of the Northern people of Protestant countries have lost their liberties ever since they changed their religion for a better."

In Denmark, as in the other Scandinavian countries, many of the external signs of the old faith remain. By way of explanation, Bumpus writes: "When the visitor to Denmark looks upon such 'instrumenta' as the folding altar-pieces in Aarhuus and Roeskilde Cathedrals, he must bear in mind that in these northern lands the Reformation was accepted by the people as a political measure, not as an act of conscience" (Cathedrals, etc., p. 80).

Norway and Iceland

Norway, ruled by the Danish kings, was Protestantized in much the same manner, though not quite so rapidly. Bugenhagen's church ordinance, drawn up in 1537 by order of Christian III., was enforced there as well as in Denmark. In Iceland there was strenuous opposition to these decrees. The Lutheran preachers sent thither were imprisoned, and it was only in 1551 that a Danish fleet put down the rebellion in that far northern

island of fire and ice, "and forced the Reformation upon the people" (Philippson, op. cit., p. 136). Bishop Jon Arason, the leader in the fight against the religious novelties, had been betrayed to the Danes, and executed by them in November, 1550. For more than three hundred years no Catholic priest set foot on the soil of Iceland, until at last the French Fathers Baudoin and Bernard took up residence there in 1859. The Catholics, who still number less than 100, now have a church, a school, and a hospital at Reikjavik, the capital.

Gustavus Vasa, King of Sweden

The rule of Christian II. in Sweden was overthrown by Gustaf Ericson, known in history as Gustavus Vasa. The son of a Swedish noble, he fought the Danes until, forced to fly from their wrath, he became a laborer in the mines of Dalecarlia. Here he fostered an insurrection in 1521, captured Upsala, and was so successful that a provincial diet elected him king, June 7, 1523. He at once embraced Lutheranism. In 1525 the Latin Mass was forbidden, the estates of bishops seized, monastic vows declared void, and excommunications nullified.

The people rose against the king's arbitrary religious decrees. The Dalecarlians especially, whose hospitality Gustaf once enjoyed, were active in revolt. But the king was determined to have his way. At the Diet of Westeras, in 1527, he demanded the confiscation of church property in behalf of the crown, and the curbing of what he called ecclesiastical encroachments. When the assembly refused to accede, he threatened to abdicate, whereupon the diet weakly capitulated. The peasants, nevertheless, did not submit without a sharp struggle. When Christian II. landed in Norway the Dalecarlians rose again, and tried to assist him; but Gustaf again defeated them, and withdrew their ancient special privileges. All the leaders of the insurrection were soon imprisoned or executed. Thus was the Reformation forced upon the people of Sweden against their wishes. The king proceeded to install Protestant bishops, and one of Melancthon's disciples, George Neumann, was appointed superintendent of the clergy. Of these measures Philippson writes:

"What appeared most clearly in all this was the king's determination to turn the Reformation to his own advantage. He made use of the visitations in single districts to possess himself of what was still left of the church silver. He did not scruple to represent himself as head of the Swedish Church. All who wished to hold fast to the faith of their fathers he threatened with the penalties of high treason, for in religious things, no less than in secular, the will of the king must be obeyed" (op. cit., p. 139).

Bumpus speaks in the same strain. "It was . . . only too apparent that the patriot king was largely influenced by the expectation of replenishing his exhausted coffers from the revenues of the Church, and, as in Germany and England, the assent of the nobility was gained by their admission to a considerable share in the confiscated property" (Cathedrals, etc., p. 74).

The Southern Uprising

Accordingly, his Majesty appointed Lutherans to govern the several bishoprics of the kingdom. The monastic houses were closed amid scenes of violence: for instance, all the Franciscan monks of Raumo were murdered when their monastery fell into the hands of the king's agents. Nor did the peasants fare better. Twelve thousand large farms were seized, to be divided among Gustaf's followers as the king saw fit. These and similar acts provoked another great uprising, this time in the southern provinces. It was led by a peasant, Nils Dacke, and more than once seemed likely to attain its object. But it was finally suppressed with great difficulty, and its suppression may be said to mark the first definite triumph of Lutheranism in Sweden.

A second diet, held in Westeras in 1544, completed the work, as far as possible, by the abolition of Catholic festivals and practices. Thenceforward, until his death in 1560, Gustaf ruled with an eye to increasing the commercial and industrial prosperity of the country, a policy in which he was highly successful, and whereby he managed to keep on good terms with his subjects. Then, too, he greatly enhanced the influence of Sweden in European affairs. Yet the net result was only the establishment of royal absolutism. "In

Sweden . . . none but the king gained power through the Reformation. The Rigsraad, once all-important, was now nothing more than a complaisant royal Council" (Cambridge Modern History, vol. II., p. 627).

Vasa's Successors

The son and successor of Gustaf Vasa, Erik XIV., reigned nine years. He allowed churches to fall into ruins, and under him the schools practically "ceased to exist." He was at last dethronged by his half-brothers Carl and Johan, rulers of hereditary dukedoms provided by their father. The latter of the two became King John III. His wife, Catherine, was a Catholic, the sister of Sigismund II. of Poland. Under her influence John leaned towards the Church, and drew up a new code of ecclesiastical discipline and a new liturgy (the "Red Book") based upon the Roman Missal. When old Lars Petri, intruded into the metropolitan see of Upsala by Gustaf Vasa, died in October, 1573, his successor was consecrated "according to the complete Catholic use," and his jurisdiction over his suffragans was restored.

John went still farther. He entered into negotiations with Pope Gregory XIII., and was even reconciled with the Church. In 1579 the see of Upsala was again vacant, and John kept it so for four years, in the hope that it might be filled by a Catholic. But he was doomed to disappointment. The Pope could not accede to the demands made by the Swedes, Queen Catherine died in 1584, and John, feeling that he had lost his principal support, gave up his efforts soon after.

His death, November 17, 1592, brought to the throne of Sweden his son Sigismund, a Catholic, who was also King of Poland. John's brother Charles assumed the government in Sigismund's name. The latter at once called a meeting which was attended mostly by Upsala preachers, who speedily rejected John's liturgy and declared the "unchanged Augsburg Confession" to be the religion of the kingdom. Sigismund was not allowed to have Catholic services even privately. Soon after, a decree was issued, commanding all non-Lutherans to leave Sweden. Finland, then

under the Swedish crown, was "evangelized" in the same manner, though Catholic practices lingered longer there. Sigismund was overthrown in 1598 and formally deposed in 1599, whereupon his Lutheran uncle ascended the throne as Charles IX., and the Reformation was at last triumphant in the land of the Goths and the Vandals.

The Upsala gathering called by Charles when regent "may be considered," says the Protestant, Rev. W. E. Collins, "the coping-stone of the Swedish Reformation. Sigismund had come to the throne with the knowledge that his new kingdom had made a definite stand from which there could be no withdrawal; and although many efforts were made during his reign on behalf of Roman Catholicism, first for concurrent establishment, and then for bare toleration, the issue was never for a moment doubtful. The Swedish Church was definitely committed to Lutheranism; the clergy continued to be an estate of the realm down to the middle of the nineteenth century; and separation from the national communion was so severely punished that until modern days organized dissent was practically unknown. . . . The definite adhesion of Sweden to the Augsburg Confession gave strength to the cause of Protestantism everywhere; it opened the way for the Protestant League of the North in the following century" (Cambridge Modern History, vol. II., p. 633).

Of the present-day Swedish church, Bumpus says: "It is a curious church in creed, in ritual and in government. . . . Here, Church and State are one. There is no dissent to speak of . . . and though there is now toleration for other religions, matters are not made particularly pleasant for their adherents. Intensely Protestant as the Swedes are, they have no sympathy with Rome, though retaining many of the rites of the old faith. They love ceremonial, as far as they can get it, and to see their churches adorned with grandiose altar-pieces, rich in imagery, crucifixes, lights, organs and paintings. All education is superintended by the clergy. All young people have to be confirmed after special instruction and examination, and no persons can be married or get any civil appointment until

they have received the Sacrament" (Cathedrals of Norway, etc., p. 88). In other words, nowhere else are Church and State so completely united,—and Sweden is the most Protestant country in the world! In 1910 the population was 5,522,403, of whom 5,497,689 belonged to the national church. Dissenting Protestants numbered 13,715, Jews, 6,112, Catholics, 3,070, other creeds, 817.

In Sweden, therefore, Protestantism has had, if anywhere, an opportunity to make its spiritual mark. Yet the religion of the people is largely a perfunctory affair. It has little vitality except that which springs from a cordial dislike of the Roman Church. Bumpus says: "Notwithstanding the national establishment, and the marvellously complete system of education, the state of the people is, morally, hardly what one would expect after so much drilling." Statistics, studied in the light of Sweden's religious history, will bear out this assertion.

XVI.

Calvin

Jean Chauvin or Cauvin, known to us as John Calvin, was born at Noyon in Picardy, June 10, 1509. His father had risen to prominence as a lay-member of the court of the Bishop of that city, and gave John a training to fit him for the Church, though later he favored the law instead. The youth studied the arts at Paris and jurisprudence at Orleans, where he met a German professor, Melchior Vollmar, who made him a Humanist. French Humanism was quite decidedly anti-Catholic, so we may, perhaps, conclude that Calvin's faith was weakened by his early associations. In a worldly way he profited by one of the abuses of his time. He obtained an ecclesiastical benefice in 1527, and another in 1529.

For some reason not quite clear, Calvin's father was excommunicated, and died under the ban in 1531. Whether or not this event influenced Calvin's religious belief is doubtful. It is sometimes said that his first published work, a commentary on Seneca's "De Clementia," shows a heterodox spirit; but the most that can fairly be said of it is, that it showed no particularly religious spirit at all. Quite different was the address of Nicholas Cop, the rector of the University of Paris, delivered on All Saints' day, 1533. This was written by Calvin, and contained passages strongly savoring of Luther's doctrines of grace and faith, with the concomitant distinction between law and gospel. Both Cop and Calvin subsequently left Paris through fear of being brought to trial for heresy, and the latter went to Noyon, where he resigned his offices and seems definitely to have gone over to the new religion. In the following winter he settled at Basle.

The "Institutio"

Here Calvin wrote his "Institutio Religionis Christianae," which was published in the spring of 1536. Subsequent editions greatly enlarged and repeatedly modified the work, though all the

leading tenets of Calvinism were incorporated in the first. Of these tenets, the best known is the doctrine of absolute predestination, which is expounded as follows in Calvin's own words:

"Therefore we say that the Scripture shows that God, by His eternal and immutable counsel, once for all determined both those whom He desired one day to admit to salvation and those whom He would give back to destruction. We affirm that this counsel as to the elect is founded upon His gratuitous mercy, without any respect to human merit: but to those whom He has handed over to damnation, by His just and blameless though incomprehensible judgment, the way of life is closed.

"In the case of the elect we regard calling (vocationem) as an evidence of election, and justification another token of its manifestation, until they arrive in glory, where its fulness shall be found. Just as God seals His elect by calling and justification, so, by shutting out the rejected ones either from the knowledge of His Name or the sanctification of His Spirit, He makes known to them the judgment that awaits them" (Institutio Religionis Christianae, Liber III., cap. xxi., 7).

Froude's View of Predestination

It is astounding that this ferocious doctrine could gain adherents. Even J. A. Froude, who was partial to Calvin, wrote of it as follows: "To represent man as sent into the world under a curse, as incurably wicked—wicked by the constitution of his nature and wicked by eternal decree—as doomed, unless exempted by special grace which he cannot merit, or by any effort of his own obtain, to live in sin while he remains on earth, and to be eternally miserable when he leaves it—to represent him as born unable to keep the commandments yet as justly liable to everlasting punishment for breaking them, is alike repugnant to reason and conscience, and turns existence into a horrible nightmare. To deny the freedom of the will is to make morality impossible. To tell men that they cannot help themselves is to fling them into recklessness and despair. To what purpose the effort to be virtuous when it is an effort which is foredoomed to fail—when those

that are saved are saved by no effort of their own, and confess themselves the worst of sinners, even when rescued from the penalties of sin and those that are lost are lost by an everlasting sentence decreed against them before they were born? How are we to call the Ruler who laid us under this iron code by the name of Wise, or Just, or Merciful, when we ascribe principles of action to Him which in a human father we should call preposterous and monstrous?" (Short Studies in Great Subjects, art. Calvin).

Yet gain adherents it did; and it filled their minds with a gloomy fanaticism that makes us wonder how Calvin's stern logic could have made it acceptable even to the most rabid fanatics of his time. Yet in the long run it could not survive attack, any more than could Luther's famous "sin boldly!" The fate of these two specimens of "reformed" religion is thus commented on by the Rev. Dr. Percival, a Protestant, who wrote in The Nineteenth Century: "What person calling himself a follower of Luther would dream of advising a penitent to sin all the more in the name of Christ because 'where sin abounded there did grace more abound'? Who today believes the doctrine of Calvin on Reprobation, etc.? Most of these doctrines are as extinct as the famous dodo" (vol. 46, p. 516). Luther and Calvin are here aptly bracketed because the latter's admirers are fond of asserting his intellectual superiority over Luther by way, it would seem, of gaining for his teachings a more favorable opinion.

Other Points of Calvin's Teaching

Besides predestination, Calvin's system contained the following principal points: The Communion of Saints is the Church; that is to say, the elect. There is no priesthood, and therefore the control of each Calvinistic body rests in the community itself, hence those who preach are merely "ministers," not clergymen. Furthermore, each community is independent of every other, the synod being a bond of union only, without rights to govern. The sacraments have nothing to do with sanctifying grace, and there is no such thing as the Real Presence in the Eucharist. Resistance to the civil authorities is expressly com-

manded when they order anything contrary to God's will (i. e., as interpreted by Calvin). These views were borrowed from Wyclif, Zwingli, or Luther, and in some cases modified. The prefatory letter to the "Institutio" was addressed didactically to Francis I., King of France.

Calvin Goes to Geneva

As Calvin had some reason to fear trouble in Basle, though that city had become a stronghold of the Reformation, he went to Ferrara, where, under an assumed name, he resided for a time at the court of the duchess. Again obliged to change his residence, he set out for Germany, but made a detour to Geneva, which was then in rebellion against the Duke of Savoy. The city won its independence in the spring of 1536.

The Bishop, who was connected with the Savoyard house, naturally took the duke's part in the quarrel, and this gave a pretext to the rebels (who, from their alliance with the Swiss of Bern and Freiburg, were called Huguenots) to favor the Reformation. The new doctrines were preached by a Frenchman named William Farel, who was looking about for an assistant at the time of Calvin's arrival. The author of the "Institutio" was accordingly pressed into service, and soon gained considerable influence, which "he used," says Philippson, "to satisfy his innate love of power and to establish his violent and intolerant doctrine." This course excited popular anger, with the result that both Farel and Calvin were banished from the city in April, 1538. The latter ultimately went to Strassburg, where he became the pastor of a congregation of French Protestants. There he was brought into contact with Lutheranism, and made the personal acquaintance of many German "reformers." Luther himself, however, Calvin never met.

His Second Arrival in Geneva

Geneva meanwhile was a prey to civil and religious dissension. At last Calvin was invited to return, and he entered the city like a conqueror in September, 1541. The wildest anti-Catholic description of the alleged arrogance of Gregory VII., Innocent III., and Boniface VIII. falls far short of the prerogatives claimed for himself by

the man who made Geneva "the Protestant Rome." The "Ordonnances Ecclésiastiques" were to regulate everything. Perhaps as good a brief description of his work as we can find may be borrowed from our oft-quoted Protestant professor of history in the University of Bonn, Dr. Martin Philippson. He writes as follows, and his views are certainly not open to question as favoring the Catholic Church:

Calvin's Work in Geneva: A Non-Catholic's Recital

"The principle of authority was as thoroughly carried out in secular as in spiritual matters. Administrative and penal rules were inexorably stern and harsh. Imprisonment, torture, and death were inflicted for relatively slight offenses, especially those against morals or religion. Within four years, among the fifteen thousand inhabitants of Geneva, there were between eight and nine hundred arrests, seventy-six sentences of banishment, and fifty-eight executions!

"Calvin combined most intimately ecclesiastical and secular elements in an institution which exercised most important judicial authority, the 'Consistory.' This comprised the six chief pastors of the city and twelve lay elders chosen by the lesser council. Its duty was to watch over the conduct, morals, faith, and church attendance of every Genevan citizen; to condemn any one guilty of reprehensible behavior to public reproof, fines, or even excommunication; also, where it seemed needful, to hand the culprit over to the temporal magistrate for further punishment. Anyone who played cards or even ninepins, who smiled during religious services, who allowed himself any pleasantry concerning the church, was publicly reproved and punished by the magistrates; dancing, playing, family and popular festivals were put under the ban; the consistory went so far as to close public-houses and to set up in their place city houses of entertainment, where prayers were dealt out more bountifully than drink.

"In Geneva, Calvin realized his ideal of a state with a thoroughness and consistency as terrible as it was wonderful; a community was organized,

compared with which all former theocracies appear thoroughly worldly, in which the material life was merely the necessary foundation for the higher religious life. Preaching took place almost every day, on Sundays four times, a heavy task for the ministers, indeed, but scarcely less so for the laity, who could not absent themselves from any of these services. A spirit of service and heroic but also harsh and intolerant piety pervaded the city. The Bible and the sword were the two inseparable tokens of Calvinism.

"Calvin's victory was not won without a hard struggle. The gloomy character of the new administration, the repression of the popular element, and the judicial persecutions combined to render the situation intolerable to many. Especially the Genevese of the old stock, the genuine burghers of the city, who were attached to its liberties and hence called themselves the 'libertins,' were the most pronounced opponents of this system of oppression, which was upheld mostly by the thousands of French refugees drawn thither by Calvin.

"The latter saw the danger that threatened him and his work, and met it fearlessly, conscious as he was of being God's instrument and special protege. He sought to render the leaders of the opposition harmless by prosecuting them; but at length his tyranny went too far. The Genevese chose, as chief-burgomaster, Perrin, Calvin's chief opponent, and as Bern once more took sides against the reformer and the French party, he had to submit to the passage of a number of humiliating measures (1547). Calvin, in his letters, bitterly complains of the power of his enemies, of the cowardice, selfishness, and lack of union among his own adherents. Relying on his heavenly mission, he waited impatiently for the hour of retribution. Meanwhile he made a most skilful use of worldly means to hasten its coming. His repeated discomfiture in Geneva he attributed rightly enough to his strained relations with Bernese theologians and with the Zwinglians in general. With quick resolution he made up his mind to conclude a peace with them. In July, 1549, he went to Zurich in company with Farel, and there joined Bullinger, the most prominent theologian of the Zwinglian school, in fram-

ing the so-called 'Consensus Tigurinus' (Agreement of Zurich), which was renewed and enlarged in 1554, and finally accepted by all the reformed. This agreement, in brief, acknowledged that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper really contains the body of Christ, not materially, but through the uplifting of the believer's soul to heaven, where it comes into mystic contact with the body of the Lord. After this compact Calvin's power in the whole Reformed Church became greater than ever.

"Calvin's personal position was also greatly affected for the better by the Zurich agreement. . . . He turned his newly won advantages to immediate profit. He first dealt with the foreign Protestants — French and Italian — who had sought refuge in Geneva. Every one of them who did not accept his views was imprisoned or banished, and distance did not, in the latter case, save him from the cruel hatred of the reformer" (Age of the Reformation, pp. 276-8).

Calvin and Servetus

An instance of the methods of Calvin can be found in his treatment of Servetus. Miguel Served y Reves was born in Navarre in 1511. When only twenty years old he took part in the religious upheavals of the time, publishing a book against the doctrine of the Trinity. A second and similar work caused such general indignation that Servetus, to escape attention, turned to the study of medicine. In this field he met with considerable success, having been the first to explain correctly the function of the lungs in the circulation of the blood. The Archbishop of Vienne in France became his scientific patron, and had he thenceforward kept out of religious disputations he would have lived and died in peace. But unfortunately for himself he entered into correspondence with Calvin, and criticized the latter's views. Servetus' book, "Christianismi Restitutio," was published in 1553, whereupon Calvin denounced him to the Inquisition at Lyons, and sent thither letters, or at least fragments of letters from Servetus' correspondence, together with the latter's marginal notes on the text of the "Instititutio," which, by-the-way, had been declared by the Council of Geneva to be "a holy doctrine

against which no man might speak." Servetus was arrested, but managed to escape from Vienne; and then, like a moth toward a candle-flame, he fluttered straightway to Geneva, which he reached on August 13, 1553. He was at once held for trial. At Calvin's instance Nicholas de la Fontaine, the Genevese "reformer's" secretary, entered complaint in thirty-eight articles against Servetus, who was subjected to torture, denied counsel, and condemned to death. On October 27 he was burned at the stake.

The editor of the English translation of Philippson's work appends the following footnote to the German professor's account: "Apologists of Calvin point us to the fact that while the Grand Council of Geneva insisted that Servetus should be burned at the stake, Calvin asked for him—though in vain—the humaner death by the sword" (p. 279). There is no contemporary documentary evidence for this assertion, nor can any excuse be found in the fact that his secretary, and not Calvin in person, made the charges against Servetus. To Calvin belongs the responsibility for the proceedings, which received the emphatic approval of Luther's friend Melancthon.

In passing, let us remark that the third article in La Fontaine's complaint declared that Servetus "has not ceased by all means in his power to scatter his poison as much by his construction of the biblical text as by certain annotations which he has made upon Ptolemy." The last clause deserves special notice by those who advance the famous case of Galileo as an example of the intellectual obscurantism which the Reformation is alleged to have opposed.

Calvin's Methods

The "libertins" of Geneva had tried to save Servetus. Summary proceedings against them were accordingly taken, and, in order to render them socially and politically powerless, all of Calvin's foreign followers were given rights of citizenship. By accusing the old Genevese burghers of conspiring against him, Calvin's adherents began a struggle which afforded pretexts for banishing or executing the leaders of the old citizenry. Thus Calvin's control was secured against all popular resentment.

Calvin died May 27, 1564, in his fifty-fifth year. His work was subsequently carried on by Theodore Beza, whom he had known since young manhood. As a theologian, Calvin left a great impress upon Protestantism, not only among those who followed his system directly, but upon others as well. For instance, the influence of Calvinism is not only seen in the history of the Reformation in France, the Netherlands, and Scotland, but in some of the proceedings of Queen Elizabeth, who reduced the forty-two Anglican Articles of 1553 to thirty-nine which were evidently inspired doctrinally, though not governmentally, by Calvinistic leanings. Then, too, Oliver Cromwell's followers in the seventeenth century were "inspired and guided" by the "soul of Calvin." As for Geneva itself, much of Calvin's work was undone and a considerable part of the population won back to the Church by the labors of its great Bishop, St. Francis de Sales. Ever since his time there has been a steady increase in the proportion of the Catholic to the non-Catholic population, whilst the latter has lost much of its Calvinistic rigor, and given place in its stead to a conglomeration of nihilism, philosophical anarchy, socialism, and unbelief. Anarchist plots galore have been hatched in Geneva, and there, at the hands of one of the Reds, the Empress Elizabeth of Austria met her death, September 10, 1898. The intolerable tyranny of the sixteenth century has given place in Geneva to an equally undesirable laxity. Yet, as Canon Barry aptly says, "in history it stands out as the Sparta of the Reformed churches, and Calvin is its Lycurgus."

XVII.

The Reformation in France

The history of France during the century which preceded the Reformation might well suggest that there, if anywhere, such a religious upheaval would have been successful. The Great Schism of the West troubled the country in which the Papacy had dwelt at Avignon, and John Gerson, representing the University of Paris at the Council of Constance, called to heal the schism, maintained the theory that the Pope's supremacy was merely executive, and that he might even fall into heresy, in which case the faithful had the right to depose or imprison him. A General Council was held to be superior to the Pope. Although it is not likely that Gerson pressed these opinions on the Council with any desire other than to heal the schism, they could not fail to produce bad effects elsewhere. William of Ockam in the fourteenth century had advocated false ideas respecting the constitution of the Church, of which Gerson's later pronouncements were an echo. It is in these errors that we find the origin of Gallicanism—that subtle, oft-repeated effort to make the French Church more or less independent of the Holy See.

The disorders consequent upon the Great Schism had their reflection in the political state of France. This matter, however, we need not pursue. The story of Joan of Arc and the liberation of her country from English rule is too well known. Suffice it to say that, when King Charles VII. died in 1461, the city of Calais alone remained to the English crown of its once large possessions in France. French nationality had made enormous strides during the four decades of his reign.

The Church and the Fifteenth-Century Kings

As early as 1423, Charles had sought to make an agreement with Pope Martin V. whereby he might obtain the right of appointment to some half a thousand benefices. Among other things, he had in view the idea of destroying the feudal

power of certain French bishops, and, though the Popes themselves were opposed to episcopal feudalism, they could not approve Charles' intention, which aimed at the practical annulment of all the bishops' independent jurisdiction. In other words, the king hoped to carry on the government of the Church by direct negotiation with Rome, disregarding the bishops' rights; and to this plan the Popes could not consent.

Under Charles' successors, Louis XI. and Charles VIII., was effected the final consolidation of the French feudal territories with the domains of the crown. The former monarch, whilst a liberal patron of the universities, hospitals, and monasteries, held the clergy in subjection for financial reasons, and centered in himself, as far as possible, the power formerly held by the great feudal lords. He thus became the virtual founder of absolute monarchy in France, and his work of unification was completed by his son, Charles VIII.

French Attempts on Italy

The latter turned his attention to foreign conquest, upon which he entered by an invasion of Italy. His cousin and successor, Louis XII. (1498-1515) broke up an anti-French league, added Milan to his domains, and entered into a secret understanding with Ferdinand of Aragon to divide between them the kingdom of Naples. After attaining their purpose, however, the allies quarreled, and the French were soon driven from Naples, leaving Ferdinand in sole possession.

The Emperor Maximilian I., en route to Rome for his coronation, was not allowed to pass through Venetian territory; so to avenge the insult, he made an alliance (League of Cambrai) with Ferdinand of Aragon and Louis XII., both of whom hoped to profit territorially. Venice had, moreover, invaded the Romagna, which belonged to the Pope, and had even infringed on the spiritual authority of stern old Julius II., who accordingly joined the new League after he had been unable to reach the Venetians through remonstrances and excommunication. In the ensuing struggle, the League was victorious. The Pope withdrew from it in 1510, when the Venetians formally recognized the rights of the

Church; a step which, by-the-way, saved the Republic from the rapacity of Louis and Ferdinand.

Louis XII. Against Pope Julius II.

The two had nevertheless obtained what they coveted. Only Maximilian had failed to profit by the war, whilst Julius was satisfied with the Venetians' withdrawal from the Romagna. Yet the Pope feared the growing power of France in Italian affairs, for he had met with opposition from Louis XII. and the Emperor in his settlement with Venice. By way of revenge the two monarchs resolved to attack Julius' spiritual rights, and immediately summoned a pseudo-council to meet at Pisa. Julius in reply convoked the Eighteenth General Council—the Fifth Lateran; and, whilst waiting for the fathers to assemble, he organized the Holy League, with Ferdinand of Aragon, the Emperor Maximilian, and the Swiss Confederation as members. Henry VIII. of England joined in 1512.

Louis XII. forthwith invaded Italy, but was disastrously defeated. At the same time Henry VIII. entered France from the north and Ferdinand of Aragon overran Navarre south of the Pyrenees. In the "Battle of the Spurs" the French met with a severe reverse, whilst their ally, James IV. of Scotland, who had made a descent upon England, lost his life in the battle of Flodden Field. Peace was made among the several belligerents in 1515.

Accession of Francis I.

In the same year Louis died, and was succeeded by his cousin, Francis I. Two years earlier Leo X. had been elected Pope, and continued the policy of Julius II. toward the French. It must be borne in mind that the end for which Julius struggled was just, however regrettable may have been the spectacle of a Pope personally engaged in warfare. Apart from all consideration of Louis' infringements on Julius' spiritual authority, the French king was clearly in the wrong in his attempted Italian conquests.

From this brief recital of a century of Gallic history, it will be seen that the relations between the Pope and the French kings had nearly always been more or less tense, and this especially

just before Luther's rupture with the Church. Moreover, Francis I. was a man of weak religious and moral sense, and strongly inclined to be autocratic in his ecclesiastical policy. At first sight, therefore, it may cause surprise that the Reformation did not speedily obtain control of France, since everything had seemingly been so well prepared for it.

Yet at least one of the reasons of its failure is easily found. The peace negotiated between Leo X. and Francis I., when the latter seemed likely to advance upon Rome, found expression in the Concordat made with the Pope in 1516, which recognized the king's right to nominate, not merely to a few hundred ecclesiastical posts as claimed by Charles VII. when he attempted to bargain with Pope Martin V. nearly a century before, but to all the benefices in France. Whilst the new agreement quashed for good the feudal rights claimed by certain bishops, and therefore ended the fear of schism from that quarter, it placed in the royal hands the temporalities of the French Church to a degree that certainly strengthened the possibilities of serious abuse. And, unfortunately, those abuses became realities in a very short time.

Yet the Concordat had this good effect: Francis I. had now no reason openly to support the Reformation. Be it remembered that the great revolt succeeded only where it met with royal sanction always prompted by the desire to possess the lands and revenues of the Church. Gustaf Vasa in Sweden, Frederick I. in Denmark, Henry VIII. in England, the German princelings and the Swiss municipal and cantonal councils, were all actuated by greed, and all encouraged the movement for selfish ends. But Francis I. already enjoyed the disposal of ecclesiastical property, hence the Reformation offered no inducements to him. It must, of course, be understod that the confirmation in their spiritual jurisdiction of the royal nominees was unconditionally reserved to the Pope. That right could not be yielded, and Francis knew better than to ask for it. The Concordat of 1516, then, had its good and its bad sides. Whilst on the one hand it opened the door to administrative

evils, on the other it did much to save France to the Church.

Circumstances Favoring Protestantism

All this notwithstanding, however, Protestantism made a determined effort to capture France, and more than a century of civil and religious conflict was the upshot. A few circumstances favorable to the Reformation may be enumerated. First, Humanism flourished in the kingdom after the Italian campaigns, and in France it assumed a decidedly anti-Catholic character. Francis I. founded the Royal College, the Humanists of which were opposed to the scholasticism of the University of Paris, and leaned quite strongly to Lutheranism. Among the early adherents of the new religion in France was the king's own sister Marguerite, whose marriage to Henri d'Albret, King of Navarre, made her husband's court a rendezvous for Protestant fugitives. Secondly, Francis himself was not hostile to the innovations on religious grounds. Apart from the privileges granted him by the Concordat of 1516, his opposition to Protestantism arose out of fear that it would jeopardize the newly-acquired national unity. In fact, so favorably otherwise did he regard Lutheranism in its earlier days that he even thought of appointing Melancthon to the rectorship of the Royal College. The king was in truth the possessor of a purely political conscience. If he frowned upon the Reformation in France, it was for selfish ends; and for the same selfish ends he was ever ready to encourage German "reformers," that thereby the power of his enemy, the Emperor Charles V., might be weakened.

War Against the Vaudois

Thirdly, the south of France had been more or less infected with heresy ever since the days of the Albigenses. Then, too, there were in Provence many Waldenses, or Vaudois, a sect which derived its name from its founder, Waldo. These people were expelled from the Papal territories of Avignon and the Venaissin, and, after making an alliance with the Swiss Protestants, they began to pillage churches and attack priests.

Francis I., fearful that the Reformation would

disrupt his realm, had already taken measures to prevent the spread of Lutheranism. A number of executions took place; but the first anti-Reformation movement on a large scale was that against the Vaudois. After the uprising in Provence, the parliament of Aix had decreed the death penalty for its leaders, but Francis suspended it for five years. Meantime the Vaudois prepared for war. In 1540 the Edict of Fontainebleau ordered vigorous measures against heresy, which was denounced as a crime against the state. This affected the Lutherans as well as the Vaudois, but, since the latter had again desecrated churches, Francis I. sent troops to Oppede, president of the parliament of Aix, who exceeded all bounds of moderation in his reprisals. It is said that twenty-two villages were destroyed and three thousand men slain in the "Massacre of the Vaudois" (April, 1545).

Schaff and other non-Catholic writers have lamented these proceedings against "innocent people." The Vaudois were far from innocent, though that fact does not, of course, justify the savagery of Oppede's course.

The measures taken by Francis against heresy, springing as they did largely from the king's political dislike of the innovations, reacted by giving to French Protestantism a political character which afterwards made it a state within a state. But at the time of the king's death in 1547 it had not yet assumed that distinction.

Calvinism Dominant in France

All this time Calvin was holding forth in Geneva. He worked incessantly to introduce his religion into his native France through letters, books, personal messengers, and instructions to the French fugitives who came to Geneva. He succeeded to this degree: those who had been following Luther and others were nearly all won over, and so it has been well said that "from the middle of the sixteenth century Protestantism in France is practically synonymous with Calvinism."

Henry II. and Francis II.

Francis' successor, Henry II., devoted his attention to the Calvinists. In 1551 the Edict of

Fontainebleau was directed against them, and in 1555 another decree turned over to the secular courts all ecclesiastical trials. When Henry afterwards tried to restore these to the bishops' courts, the parliament of Paris blocked his attempt, so thenceforth it was simply a case of the French State versus Calvinism. The latter gained the adherence, for political ends, of the Bourbons and Chatillons, and was powerful enough in 1559 to hold a general synod in Paris, at which was drawn up a confession of faith, and a resolution adopted to the effect that all "heretics"—meaning Catholics and dissenters—should be put to death.

Henry II. died July 10, 1559. His youthful son and successor, Francis II., was married to Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots. His mother was the famous Catherine de' Medici, a thoroughgoing Machiavellian, crafty, unscrupulous, and irreligious. She struggled with the Catholic House of Guise for the control of the government. But Duke Francis of Guise was a very strong man. He had just captured Calais, and by the expulsion of the English from their last foothold in Continental France, had become a national hero. A younger brother, Charles, a man of exemplary life and no mean ability, was Archbishop of Rheims and a Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church; he is usually known in history as the Cardinal of Lorraine. To this powerful family Mary Stuart was related on her mother's side; and her influence secured the supremacy of the Guises as against the House of Bourbon, which, under St. Louis, had become related to the reigning House of Valois.

XVIII.

The Reformation in France (Continued)

That supremacy, however, did not remain long unchallenged, for Catherine de' Medici soon assumed, to all intents and purposes, the regency of the kingdom. To the Bourbon prince, Henry of Navarre, the Huguenots looked for leadership; his grandmother Marguerite (sister of Francis I.) having been one of the earliest French adherents of the Reformation, and his mother, Jeanne d'Albret, one of its staunch supporters. Catherine unscrupulously played off one party against the other. Although the Cardinal of Lorraine was soon made to learn that the queen-mother would not tolerate his advice, she had no hesitation in supporting the Guises when she thought it politic to do so, nor did she fail to sympathize with Henry of Navarre and his associate, Prince Louis Condé and Admiral Gaspard Coligny, the Protestant leaders of France, when she found such a step profitable.

Such tactics naturally strengthened the Huguenots, as the disaffected Protestants were called. Besides, a number of politically wavering Catholics joined their ranks, and a compromise party rose under the nominal leadership of Michel d'Hopital, keeper of the seal, whose course was encouraged by Catherine for political ends. To such an extent had the influence of Calvanism increased that in seven years (1555-1562) 2,150 communities had been organized, and alliances made with Elizabeth of England and the Protestant German princes. Everything, in fact, had thus far worked out to the advantage of the Huguenots.

The Conspiracy of Amboise

Even before the death of Henry II., however, the Protestant party made its first attempt to seize the reins of government. This was the conspiracy of Amboise, approved conditionally by Calvin, and, as Lingard shows, certainly instigated by Elizabeth of England, then in the first year of her reign. The affair was ostensibly arranged by one La Renaudie to curb the growing power of the Guises. John de Barri was to carry it out

by taking the king into custody, putting the Guises to death, and electing Condé to the regency. But the plot was discovered by the Duke of Guise, and thus, so to speak, nipped in the bud. Several ringleaders were executed, but Condé was not arrested for the time. Later, however, he was sentenced to death for participation in a new conspiracy, but was not executed because Catherine, after she had become regent, almost at once bestowed her favor upon the Bourbons and their allies.

Formation of "The Triumvirate"

Francis II. died December 5, 1560, and his brother, Charles IX., became king. Just before Francis' death the States-General (the national gathering of the representatives of the three estates of the realm: nobility, clergy and people) had been convoked, and the Huguenots, who were only a very small part of the nation, managed to obtain a majority in the sessions. Enjoying high favor at court, they speedily provoked armed encounters with the Catholics, and this condition convinced some of the hitherto dissatisfied amongst the latter that only their hearty support of the Guises could rescue the Catholic cause. Accordingly the Constable de Montmorency, uncle of the Colignys, who had heretofore supported the Huguenots, joined Duke Francis of Guise and the Marshal St.-André in an oath to defend the Catholic religion in France (Easter Sunday, 1561). This alliance was called by its opponents the "Triumvirate."

The Conference of Poissy

The Huguenots had meantime demanded a religious conference. With Catherine's sanction one was therefore summoned to Poissy, where they were represented, among others, by Calvin's successor, Theodore Beza, whilst the Cardinal of Lorraine was one of the chief Catholic protagonists. As usual, the nature of the Holy Eucharist was an important topic of debate. Beza's insistence on Calvin's Eucharistic views speedily nullified all efforts at reconciliation. But one unexpected result followed the conference. Antoine de Bourbon, who had become King of Navarre (lower Navarre, or Béarn, on the French side of the Pyrenees) upon his marriage to the

Protestantizing Queen Jeanne d'Albret, granddaughter of Francis I., had entertained grave misgivings as to the truth of the Protestant contentions, and was brought to a decision by the debtaes at Poissy. His submission to the Church soon followed, and he joined the Guise party. (The Huguenot leader, Henry of Navarre, afterwards Henry IV. of France, was his son).

Generally, however, the outcome of the conference was unfortunate. By spreading the report that they had secured freedom of worship, the Huguenots roused their previously armed cohorts all over France. Catholic churches were sacked and desecrated, the Blessed Sacrament was outraged, priests and nobles murdered, and vast tracts of fertile land laid waste. The material results to France were not unlike those of the peasants' uprising in Germany nearly forty years earlier. Catherine and her advisers thereupon granted the so-called Edict of Toleration (January 17, 1562). Whilst it ordered the restoration of Catholic churches and other properties, it gave official recognition to the Huguenots, and thereby paved the way for more trouble.

The "Massacre of Vassy"

Anthony of Navarre, who had become lieutenant-general of the realm, summoned Guise, St.-André, and Montmorency to Paris to protect the rights of their co-religionists. Whilst en route the followers of Guise collided on March 1 with an assembly of armed Huguenots at Vassy, and the duke was wounded in an effort to prevent disorder. Thus roused to anger, his soldiers gave battle, and some fifty or sixty Huguenots were killed outright or mortally wounded in the struggle.

Protestant writers are wont to place all the blame for this unfortunate affair upon the shoulders of the Catholics. For instance, Dr. Fisher of Yale deposes and says: "The Protestants were holding their religious service in a spacious barn. Thither he (Guise) sent some of his men, who provoked a conflict. The rest of the troops came to the spot, tore off the door, and with guns and sabres slaughtered and wounded a large number of the unarmed, defenseless congregation, and plundered their houses. Guise looked on, and did

not hinder the work. In fact, he had come to the town with the design of putting an end to the Huguenot worship there" (The Reformation, p. 267). These distorted statements were inspired by the non-Catholic French writer Henri Martin, and are thoroughly **ex parte.**

Dr. Lingard's account may be offered as the view of a painstaking Catholic historian. "The French reformed writers," he says, "generally ascribe the war to an affray, commonly called by them the Massacre of Vassy, in which about sixty men were slain by the followers of the Duke of Guise. But 1st, there is every reason to believe that this affray was accidental, and provoked by the religionists themselves. See La Popelin, vol. iv. p. 283; and the declaration of the duke on his death-bed, preserved by Brantonie, who was present, both at Vassy and at his death. 2d. The affray happened on March 1, yet the Calvinists at Nismes began to arm on the 19th of February, at the sound of the drum. They were in the field and defeated De Flassans on March 6." (History of England, vol. vii., p. 310, note.)

Guise himself is commonly represented as a particularly bloodthirsty man. Yet the Protestant historian Leopold von Ranke observes that "this gallant soldier was not disposed to deeds of violence. He is represented as rather of a quiet and even phlegmatic temperament; he was praised for the mildness he exhibited towards conquered enemies, and for the self-control with which he sought to rectify any injustice that might have been committed" (Civil War and Monarchy in France, Garvey's trans., ed. 1853, p. 210).

The First Civil War

The first civil war now broke out. Paris was secured for the king, and Condé "fortified Orleans for the insurgents. Each party displayed that ferocious spirit, that thirst for vengeance, which distinguishes civil and religious warfare. . . . Though the Calvinists were formidable by their union and enthusiasm, they did not form more than the one hundredth part of the population of France. Still the prince (Condé) cherished strong hopes of success" (Lingard). And no wonder. He and Coligny had obtained help from the Eng-

lish queen in exchange for the cities of Havre and Dieppe. The Catholic army proceeded against Rouen, a Huguenot stronghold, and captured it, but Anthony of Navarre lost his life in the assault.

At Dreux Condé on the Huguenot and Montmorency on the Catholic side were made prisoners, and St.-André was murdered. Guise himself fell by a poisoned bullet at the siege of Orleans. The Huguenots gained many privileges through the peace of Amboise, entered into through a desire to drive the English from France. The Catholic Montmorency and the Protestant Condé, both liberated by their captors, then made common cause and drove the English from Dieppe and Havre. Elizabeth, thus deserted by the French Calvinists, was made to drink of the cup of insincerity and falsehood which she had often presented to the lips of others.

A New Uprising

After three years of peace, the triumph of Scottish Calvinists over their queen, Mary Stuart, and the troubles of the same sect in the Netherlands, aroused their co-religionists in France to another revolt. Condé and Coligny attempted to capture Paris, but were defeated at the cost, to the Catholics, of the life of their leader, Montmorency. After a truce, which the Calvinists repeatedly violated, Charles IX. dismissed his mother's adviser, L'Hopital, (who had been responsible for much of the vacillating duplicity of the court), and nullified all previous decrees in favor of the Huguenots.

An effort was now made to bring the Huguenot leaders to justice. Thereupon Condé and Coligny fled to La Rochelle, where, with the aid of Henry of Navarre, they began the third civil war. But they met with severe reverses at Jarlac, where Condé fell in battle, and at Montcontour, where Coligny was routed by the Duke of Anjou. Yet in the Peace of St. Germain-en-Laye (1570) they obtained freedom of worship everywhere in France except at Paris, and the right to maintain garrisons in four strongholds. These grants surpassed any concessions previously obtained under the most favorable circumstances, and greatly emboldened the Huguenot faction.

The Massacre of St. Bartholomew

We are now approaching the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, one of the most hotly debated questions of history. A discussion of its several aspects would take us too far afield, and besides, essays on the subject are numerous. Here it suffices to say that the treaty of St. Germain not only deprived the Catholics of their advantages gained in the field, but failed entirely to promote the peace of which the realm stood so much in need. Under Catherine's influence, Charles IX. began to lean upon Coligny as an adviser, and so was led to consider an alliance with England and to consent to the marriage of his sister, Marguerite, with Henry of Navarre,—a scheme carefully fostered as a compromise by the queen-mother. Coligny induced Charles to send troops against the Spaniards in the Netherlands, and the king did so. Coligny and Catherine quarrelled over this step, which the latter had opposed. The former was seeking to embroil France in war with Spain, and when Catherine found that the king could not be induced to reject Coligny's plans, she determined forthwith to get rid of him.

The marriage of Marguerite with Henry, celebrated without the necessary ecclesiastical dispensations and certainly without the bride's consent, took place on August 18. The Huguenot leaders came to Paris to assist at the ceremony. Meantime Catherine took counsel with her son Henry, Duke of Anjou, in order to get rid of Coligny. On the morning of August 22 the Admiral was fired upon and slightly wounded, and, naturally, the attempt aroused to the highest point the anger of the Huguenots. Retaliation was freely threatened, and Catherine was thereby forced to reveal to the king that she and Anjou had planned the assault on Coligny. She begged Charles to authorize a sudden stroke at the Huguenot leaders in order to save the court from their vengeance, and the king, after much resistance, yielded. The attack began in the night of August 23-24. Coligny was slain by a band led by the young Duke of Guise, and the massacre soon became indiscriminate. Catholic prelates like the Archbishops of Lyons, Bordeaux, and Toulouse,

and the Bishop of Lisieux, saved many who would otherwise have fallen.

Protestant writers have charged the massacre to a premeditated plan to which the Church was a party, and have greatly exaggerated the sum total of its victims. But the deeds of intolerance of which others were guilty, are often suppressed. The fact that the Calvinists had murdered large numbers of Catholics (e. g., in the "Michelade" at Nimes in 1569) is condoned or overlooked altogether, yet it must be taken into account if a just estimate of the occurences which led to the affair of St. Bartholomew is to be made.

A quotation from the non-Catholic author Henry White will fitly close our few words on this much discussed topic. He says:

"A few of the murderers—men of overheated fanaticism—may have truly believed they were doing God a service by putting heretics to death. . . . But the majority were impelled by the lowest of all possible motives—jealousy and ambition filled the breast of Catherine de Medicis . . . Guise dreamed but of revenge . . . The massacre of St. Bartholomew arose out of the paltriest and most selfish of motives . . . The plea of religion was never put forward, though it is a plea too often employed to extenuate what cannot be justified." (History of St. Bartholomew, pp. 460-462.)

XIX.

The Reformation in France (Concluded)

In the following year the Duke of Anjou attempted to reduce La Rochelle, but whilst in the field he was elected King of Poland. His withdrawal raised the siege, and led to a treaty which considerably strengthened the Huguenots. Then appeared the "Politicians," a body of Catholics who sought the overthrow of both Catherine and the Guises through alliance with their enemies. The king's youngest brother, Francis, was their leader. In 1574 Charles IX. died, and his crown passed to the new King of Poland, who returned to France as Henry III., a dissolute monarch who gave his mother a free hand in the affairs of his kingdom. The Politicians and the Huguenots then proceeded to form a new party, the "Malcontents," which, with foreign aid waged a fifth civil war in the Calvinist cause, and obtained, in the Peace of Boilieu, great concessions,—one being the acquisition of eight more fortified places, and another, the right to hold public office. Henry of Navarre and the king's brother, Francis, who was now Duke of Anjou, obtained the government of large territories.

The Catholics soon realized that the policy of Henry III. meant the utter ruin of their best interests. To defend these, the Holy League was formed under the leadership of the young Duke of Guise. For once the Catholics had the co-operation of Catherine, who drew Francis of Anjou away from the Malcontents, and persuaded the king to take command of the League. The royal declaration that the Catholic faith was the only religion recognized by the laws of France provoked another civil war, in which the Huguenots were worsted; though they subsequently recovered practically all of their former privileges by the treaty of Bergerac.

The Disputed Succession

So the troubles went on, until the death of the king's brother Francis brought to the fore the question of succession to the throne. Henry III. was childless. Henry of Navarre advanced a claim on the ground of proximity of relationship,

but French law excluded non-Catholics, just as today English law excludes Catholics from the royal succession. Duke Henry of Guise put forth as his candidate Cardinal Bourbon, Archbishop of Rouen, uncle of Henry of Navarre, and obtained for him the support of Philip II. of Spain. The Holy League again assembled, and Henry III., realizing what war would mean under circumstances so critical, asked his mother to work for the maintenance of peace. Hostilities nevertheless broke out. Henry of Navarre had the assistance of large bodies of foreign Protestant troops, and won the great battle of Coutras, but Guise recovered the initiative and routed the foreigners with heavy loss. On the invitation of the city of Paris he then proceeded thither against the orders of Henry III., and without bloodshed gained control of the capital, from which the king fled in dismay.

Murder of the Guises

A truce between monarch and League having been arranged, the States-General were convoked at Blois. The law excluding Protestants from the royal succession was here reiterated. But Henry III. at last was able to wreak vengeance on the Guises. By treachery and the king's direct command the duke was assassinated on the morning of December 23, 1588, and the next day his brother, Cardinal de Guise, was strangled. A third brother, the Duke of Mayenne, at once took up the leadership of the Holy League, and in the following month Catherine de' Medici breathed her last.

The fate of the Guises roused all classes against the king. The Sorbonne declared that the people were released from their allegiance to a murderer. The reigning Pope, Sixtus V., denounced the assassination of the Cardinal, and the city of Paris proclaimed the Duke of Mayenne regent of France. Henry III. fled for safety to Henry of Navarre, who planned an expedition against Paris. The king accompanied the troops, but only to meet his death. At Saint-Cloud, just outside the capital, he was fatally stabbed by Jacques Clement, a Dominican monk who had become crazed through brooding over the misfortunes of his country. In his last hours the dying king

designated Henry of Navarre as his successor, and won from him a promise to embrace the Catholic faith.

The First Bourbon King of France

Thus the House of Bourbon obtained the French crown in the person of Henry IV., but as events proved, only after a struggle against the claims advanced by Henry's uncle. Finally he made his profession of faith, was crowned in 1593, and at last entered Paris in 1594. A year later Pope Clement VIII. released him from all censures, an act which obtained for Henry the recognition of the Holy League, still under the leadership of his erstwhile opponent, the Duke of Mayenne. The war with Spain ended in 1598, and in the same year the king promulgated the Edict of Nantes, establishing the privileges of the Huguenots, and allowing them to hold their fortified places for eight years. They were thus able to retain much of their independence of the state, a fact which fomented domestic discord for a long time. The edict was finally revoked by Louis XIV. in 1685, and, since the Huguenots had by that time acquired considerable wealth and industrial competence, their departure from France materially injured the country. Louis' war-minister, Louvois, was especially concerned in the repression of the Calvinists, a step which, whilst undoubtedly regrettable in many ways, was not altogether unjustified. It is not necessary, however, to defend the action of Louis XIV. He was a proponent of absolutism, and on occasion showed himself as autocratic in his bearing towards the Church as he did toward other people and institutions. After all is said, his conduct toward the Huguenots was inspired by the thoroughly Protestant principle, "Cujus regio, ejus religio." It certainly was not dictated by Catholic teachings, all thoughtless assertions to the contrary notwithtanding.

It is, perhaps, not as well known as it ought to be, that Pope Innocent XI. expressed his displeasure with Louis XIV. for his harshness toward the Huguenots. Innocent's envoy at the court of James II. of England was directed to seek the good offices of that monarch in an ef-

fort to induce the French king to reconsider his severe measures.

Such, in brief, was the struggle between the old Church and the Reformation for religious supremacy in France. As we have seen, it was in no small measure a struggle carried on in the interests of Calvinism for purely political reasons. The constant portrayal of the Huguenots as innocent lambs led to the slaughter, is not historically truthful. The French Protestants were anything but meek and tolerant. Philippson, speaking of the success of the Reformation elsewhere, says: "The Calvinists, or Huguenots, as they were often called, were the ones who made a similar result impossible in France by their violent and unlawful conduct. Whenever they were in the majority they ill-treated the Catholics, and deprived them of their churches" (Age of the Reformation, p. 304).

Louis Battifol, in his Century of the Renaissance, (part of the National History of France), a work crowned by the Academie des sciences morales et politiques, writes:

"At the conference of Saint-Bris held in 1586, Catherine de' Medici, discussing matters with the Vicomte de Turenne, Henry of Béarn's envoy, said: 'The King will have but one religion in France.' The Protestant replied: 'We are of the same mind, madam, but it must be our religion.' This had long been the case in Béarn, where Jeanne d'Albret had succeeded in abolishing Catholicism. The Huguenots would fain have ended by making France a Protestant country against her will. But France was recalcitrant. The reign of Henry III. is the history of the definitive Catholic reaction against the exclusive designs or aspirations of the Protestants.

"Until about 1564, Protestantism had steadily increased and developed. From that time forth it ceased to grow. The causes of this arrest are numerous, but amongst the reasons which led to the revival of Catholicism, the sight of the destruction for which the Huguenots were responsible was certainly one of the most potent. Lippomano on his journey across France in 1577 noted with horror all the unrepaired ravages with which he met—devastated towns, plundered monasteries, cathedrals in ruins, crumbling churches,

violated tombs, and disinterred bones. Orleans, Blois, Tours, and Poitiers were in a deplorable condition. 'The sight of these things is truly lamentable,' he said, 'and it is difficult to understand how men can let themselves go to such a pitch of ferocity and barbarity as to rage against mere stones.' The public conscience awoke in revolt. But the work of destruction did not cease. In spite of the peace that had been proclaimed, Jean Faurin remarks, acts of hostility were continually perpetrated. During the course of twenty-seven years this same Faurin had witnessed 459 sieges, captures of castles, and surprise attacks in the region round Castres. The people were exasperated beyond endurance" (Elsie Finnimore Buckley's trans., pp. 240-242).

Dean Maitland, in his Dark Ages, quotes in the original French several valuable contemporary statements which tell of the havoc wrought by the Huguenots. Macaulay, in his Essay on Hallam, writes:

"Beyond all doubt the proceedings of the Huguenots . . . had given much more trouble to the French monarchy than the Catholics have ever given to the English monarchy since the Reformation; and that, too, with much less excuse."

Buckle, in his History of Civilization, vol. II, page 53, declares that "during many years the French Protestants, who affected to appeal to the right of private judgment, were more intolerant of the exercise of that judgment than were the Catholics." A little farther on (page 55) he adds: "Whatever may be the popular notion respecting the necessary intolerance of the Catholics, it is an indisputable fact that early in the seventeenth century they displayed in France a spirit of forbearance and a Christian charity to which the Protestants could make no pretense."

Such testimony, set forth not from the Catholic standpoint, has a value peculiarly its own.

XX.

The Reformation in the Netherlands

The Netherlands, or Low Countries, long under Burgundian rule, were reorganized by the Emperor Charles V. with a territory somewhat the same as that of the present kingdoms of Holland and Belgium, with parts of several French departments. Charles was himself a native of the Netherlands, having been born at Ghent in 1500. He therefore naturally took a decided personal interest in their government and relations to his vast empire.

The abuses which served as pretexts to the Reformers elsewhere were not unknown in the Netherlands. The bishops of Liège, for example, were temporal lords who sometimes gave too much attention to their political interests. Undeserving men here, as elsewhere, were often intruded into the sanctuary. Yet it cannot be said that no attempts were made to cure these and similar evils. The famous Nicholas Cusa visited the country, and inaugurated remedies which proved highly beneficial; but the more radical element among the Humanists was unfortunately strong, and led by Erasmus himself, these men attacked the abuses of the day in such a manner that the people lost much of their respect for the Church. Under the circumstances, it was not surprising that the Lutherans very early attempted to gain a foothold in the Netherlands, more especially since there were many Dutch and Flemish scholars at Wittenberg, then under Luther's influence. The northern city of Emden, the Flemish city of Antwerp, and the Augustinian convent at Dordrecht became the centers whence the prophets of the new religion departed to spread their doctrines.

The Measures of Charles V.

As early as March 22, 1521, Charles V. issued at Malines a decree against the publication or reading of Lutheran books. The later Edict of Worms was in its turn ordered to be enforced, and the Emperor commanded all the lay judges of his hereditary dominions to proceed against

the teachers of new doctrines. This decision in effect took away from ecclesiastical courts the power to judge in matters of heresy, and it is well to bear the fact in mind, since much has been written about the ferocity of such tribunals in the Netherlands. To this subject we shall devote a few words at the end of this chapter.

In spite of the severity with which Charles' orders were carried out, the religious innovations made considerable progress. The theory of repression was, in short, a blunder. The people were ambitious and energetic, and therefore all the harder to manage by any process of compulsion. In spite of its absurdities, Anabaptism under Melchior Hofmann flourished at Amsterdam and elsewhere, and it was from Haarlem and Leyden that Benkelszoon and Matthyszoon went to fan the flames of fanaticism in Muenster.* Vigorous steps were taken to prevent the spread of this sect. The activities of Charles V. were, in fact, chiefly directed against it; and, indeed, when the terrible results of Anabaptist teachings elsewhere are considered, even the warmest advocate of the Reformation must admit that the authorities did not attempt to suppress it without some show of reason.

Alleged Number of Victims

These considerations bring to the fore a much-mooted question: how many persons were executed under the repressive acts of Charles V.? That the Anabaptists furnished the great majority is admitted by all classes of historians. The English writer, J. Ellis Barker, who is certainly no friend of the Church, has this to say: "The Inquisition was established in the Netherlands in 1550; and during the reign of Charles V. 50,000 victims were sacrificed to the Moloch of intolerance, according to Meteren. Grotius places the number of victims even as high as 100,000" (Rise and Decline of the Netherlands, p. 66). This quotation affords a good example of the cross-eyed method in history. The figures are given without comment, although both Meteren and Hugo de Groot (Grotius) had an interest in exaggerating them. One cannot help wondering

*See page 104.

what Anabaptism, with its savage and sanguinary communism, should be called if the Catholic Church deserves to be stigmatized as "the Moloch of intolerance."

Happily, however, we have at hand the means of controlling such reckless citations. Petrus Johannes Blok, professor of Dutch History in the University of Leyden, is not a Catholic, and he has this advantage as an authority over Barker and others of like ilk: he is a native of the country whose history he teaches in one of its universities. "How large, in truth," he writes, "was the number of martyrs? That it never reached the figure of 100,000, or even 50,000, which is usually accepted on the ground of a statement of Hugo de Groot and an expression of William of Orange in his apology, is indeed certain. These figures really comprise a greater number than the reformed congregations in their entirety. If the martyrs' books be accepted, the sum of sufferers barely reaches a thousand" (History of the Dutch People, Ruth Putnam's trans., part II., p. 317). Yet even this figure is certainly too high, and may be very considerably too high.

Philip II. in the Netherlands

On October 25, 1555, in Brussels, Charles V. publicly surrendered to his son Philip II. the government of the Netherlands. At this time the Reformation had by no means triumphed; indeed, it could claim but a very small part of the population; yet there were three distinct Protestant movements then under way. The first of these was Lutheranism, with a modiflying element of Zwinglian doctrine; the second, like the first in a rather weakened condition, was Anabaptism; and the third, becoming more vigorous, was Calvinism. Their commercial prosperity had on the whole, been detrimental to the morals of the nobility and the people, whilst the prevalence of Humanism had played havoc with their respect for the Church. Then, too, they were deeply attached to political freedom; and the combination of all these circumstances demanded a ruler of great tact, consummate prudence, ripe judgment, and sympathy with those whom he was called to govern. Philip II., unfortunately, possessed none of these traits.

In language and tastes an utter stranger to the people of the Netherlands, he left the country in 1559, never to return. Thenceforth he ruled these northern dominions from far-off Spain. He was despotic and crafty, yet in fairness to him it must be said that he sincerely desired to be just in his government, and to that end he sacrificed no time in alien pursuits. He succeeded in obtaining a readjustment of the hierarchy of the country, which, until 1559, had only five resident bishops, the greater part of its territory being under the jurisdiction of foreign sees,—a fact which tended to promote religious disorders, since it was difficult to make the necessary episcopal visitations. Moreover, the resident bishops themselves were subject to foreign metropolitans.

The Enlarged Hierarchy

Pope Paul IV. therefore raised the sees of Cambrai and Utrecht to metropolitan rank, and created the new metropolitan see of Mechlin, or Malines (occupied today by Cardinal Mercier). The bishoprics of Tournai, Arras and Liège remained, the last very much reduced in territory, and to them were added the new bishoprics of Antwerp, Ghent, Bruges, Ypres, St. Omer, Namur, s'Hertogenbosch,* Roermond, Haarlem, Deventer, Leeuwarden, Groningen, and Middelburg. Of these the archbishopric of Cambrai and the bishopric of Arras are now in France; to them was added, four years ago, the new diocese of Lille. Malines, Ghent, Bruges, Namur, Tournai, and Liège are in Belgium; Utrecht, s'Hertogenbosch, Roermond, Haarlem, and Deventer are in Holland; the others have been suppressed. This bit of ecclesiastical geography will give the reader an idea of the extent of the Spanish Netherlands in the time of Philip II.

That monarch was one of the most powerful in history. With enormous revenues, supreme alike on land and sea, the resources of America and the East Indies at his command, and his undoubted loyalty to the Church, it was most unfortunate that he was without the qualifications of a statesman. Yet for the first few years he ruled the Netherlands cautiously, with Margaret,

*Often known by its French name, Bois-le-Duc.

Duchess of Parma, as regent, and Cardinal Granvella, Archbishop of Malines, as her counselor. The erection of the new bishoprics was one of the earliest subjects of agitation. It became necessary to incorporate with them abbeys, in order to provide them with sufficient revenues, and, since many of the abbots enjoyed the right of voting in the States-General, that right, too, passed to the bishops. The prerogative of royal nomination to these sees in turn caused the king to regard the political rather than the ecclesiastical fitness of their occupants, since through them he gained considerable influence in the parliament. Besides, the abbeys resented their incorporation without recompense, and the Protestant leaders pretended to see in the whole transaction a veiled attempt to introduce the Spanish Inquisition into the country.

Growing Difficulties

In 1564 the malcontents succeeded in procuring the removal of Granvella,—a disastrous step. The nobles began to intrigue under the leadership of the Count of Egmont and William of Nassau, Prince of Orange, (William the Silent), the latter of whom, a political opportunist, had been raised a Catholic, but had gone over to Protestantism on his marriage to a daughter of Coligny. Calvinism now began to make rapid advances, largely through the immigration of numbers of Huguenots who settled chiefly in Antwerp. William the Silent entered into correspondence with the German Protestant princes and with Coligny; and whilst this preliminary agitation was in progress, Philip II., in October, 1565, ordered that all the laws of Charles V. against heresy be immediately and severely enforced.

The Iconoclasts

The nobles retaliated by declaring, in the Compromise of Breda, their purpose to resist. Several hundreds of their followers appealed in person to Margaret of Parma at Brussels, and obtained the temporary suspension of the king's edict. From a remark made in derision by one of their opponents, who called them a "crowd of beggars," they derived their party name, the "Gueux" (beggars). They were not slow to avail themselves of the advantage afforded by the sus-

pension of the royal order. A crowd of Calvinist preachers entered the country, and a body of fanatics who called themselves Iconoclasts soon gained the upper hand. A resolution was then passed to sustain Calvinism by force. On August 14, 1566, the churches of St. Omer were wrecked by a mob of Iconoclasts, and the spirit of insurrection spreading, the work of plunder and sacrilege grew by what it fed on. Malines, Ghent, Tournai, Valenciennes, all witnessed frightful violence. The magnificent cathedral of Antwerp was sacked and desecrated, and before Margaret of Parma was able to recover control, more than a thousand Catholic churches and monasteries had been pillaged.

William H. Prescott was not prejudiced in favor of the Catholic Church. Yet, after a graphic description of the sack of the Antwerp Cathedral, he says:

"Thus the work of plunder and devastation went on vigorously throughout the land. Cathedral and chapel, monastery and nunnery, religious houses of every description, even hospitals, were delivered up to the tender mercy of the Reformers. . . . In the general sack not even the abode of the dead was respected; and the sepulchres of the counts of Flanders were violated, and laid open to the public gaze.

"The deeds of violence perpetrated by the Iconoclasts were accompanied by such indignities as might express their contempt for the ancient faith. They snatched the wafer, says an eye witness, from the altar, and put it into the mouth of a parrot. Some huddled the images of the saints together and set them on fire, or covered them with bits of armor, and, shouting 'Vivent les Gueux!' tilted rudely against them. Some put on the vestments stolen from the churches, and ran about the streets with them in mockery. Some basted the books with butter, that they might burn more briskly. By the scholar, this last enormity will not be held light among their transgressions. It answered their purpose, to judge by the number of volumes that were consumed. Among the rest, the great library of Vicogne, one of the noblest collections of the Netherlands, perished in the flames kindled by these fanatics.

"The amount of injury inflicted during this dismal period it is not possible to estimate. Four hundred churches were sacked by the insurgents in Flanders alone. The damage to the Cathedral of Antwerp, including its precious contents, was said to amount to no less than 400,000 ducats (about a million of our money). The loss occasioned by the plunder of gold and silver plate might be computed. The structure so cruelly defaced might be repaired by the skill of the architect. But who can estimate the irreparable loss occasioned by the destruction of manuscripts, statuary, and paintings? It is a melancholy fact that the earliest efforts of the Reformers were everywhere directed against those monuments of genius which had been created and cherished by the generous patronage of Catholicism" (Philip II., Aztec edition, vol. II., pp. 56-57).

Arrival of the Duke of Alva

Philip, whose wrath was aroused by these proceedings, forthwith despatched the great Spanish general, the Duke of Alva, to crush the insurrection. Alva was a stern disciplinarian. On his arrival at Brussels he arrested several of the leaders of the Gueux, and set up the "Council of Troubles," which was soon nicknamed the "Council of Blood." It was merciless in its judgments, and undoubtedly its severity strengthened rather than weakened the Calvinist cause.

In retaliation William the Silent raised a force in Germany, received aid from England, and secured from Charles IX. of France, through Coligny's influence, 5,000 men to support William's brother, Louis of Nassau. Mons was taken by Louis, whilst William bestirred himself in other directions. In return for the French help, a substantial territorial cession was promised; but Alva's activity soon made itself felt. His son Ferdinand crushed the French, whilst William went down to defeat before Alva himself, and withdrew to France in consequence. A general uprising brought him back at the head of a new army, and the war dragged on, with here and there a notable siege (Haarlem, Leyden) to add the touch of the heroic. Alva was recalled in 1573; his successor, Luis Zuñiga y Requesens, a much milder man, died in 1576. In

November of the same year a body of mutinous Spanish troops sacked and wrecked Antwerp, then the greatest and wealthiest commercial city in the world, killing hundreds of citizens. This terrible occurence, known in history as the "Spanish Fury," effectively destroyed all immediate hope of reconciling the Netherlanders.

Spain Successful in the South

At this very time the so-called "Pacification of Ghent" was drawn up, whereby the southern provinces bound themselves to join William of Orange in expelling the Spaniards. But the south was unsuccessful, and remained under Spanish rule, whilst the northern provinces, in January, 1579, formed the Republic of the United Netherlands. When, a year later, Philip II. placed William under the ban, the United Netherlands threw off their allegiance to the Spanish crown, and William was proclaimed sovereign count of Holland and Zealand. Meantime Alexander Farnese, Duke of Parma, a gallant soldier, was completing, in a statesman-like manner, the submission of the ten southern provinces, and it was characteristic of Philip II. that the reward bestowed for this successful work was only ill-will and neglect. To the Spanish success is due the fact that the south and west remained predominantly Catholic.

In July, 1584, William of Orange was assassinated at Delft by a Burgundian named Balthasar Gerard. His son, Prince Maurice of Nassau, succeeded to his power with certain limitations. The struggle with the Duke of Parma continued, but the death of the latter, late in 1592, was a misfortune to the Spanish cause. Maurice followed up his successes in the north, whilst Philip, just before his death in 1598, turned over the southern provinces to his nephew, the Archduke Albert of Austria. Eleven years later Spain made a treaty with the United Netherlands, though it was not until 1648 that those provinces were formally recognized as independent.

Misstatements and Corrections

It is usual to find this narrative set forth as the effort of a benighted Catholic state (Spain), animated by rank bigotry, to force upon a free and religious people the outworn dogmas that they

did not want. Let it be said at once that we are not apologizing for excesses on the Spanish side. We have no desire to palliate the severity of Alva, though we nevertheless think it unfair to portray him as a soulless tyrant. The statement of the Jesuit Father Guggenberger is sound: "He (Alva) committed grievous errors of judgment and flooded the Netherlands with blood and tears, but it was not innate cruelty, an insane thirst for blood, but a stern though misunderstood sense of justice which inspired his actions. He was a terrible man, but he was not a bad man" (General History of the Christian Era, vol. II., p. 274).

It is certain that William the Silent was animated in his struggle by no desire to obtain for people who differed from him the right to their religious beliefs. For instance, in the Pacification of Ghent he induced the southern provinces to declare for full toleration of worship, whilst in his own provinces of Holland and Zealand Catholics were strictly forbidden to practise their religion. And if it be urged that this arrangement was supposed to be only temporary, we reply that it secured the result at which it aimed—the introduction of Protestantism into the Catholic provinces without recognizing the rights of Catholics where they were in the minority. As for the persecution of Catholics by the Calvinists, the campaign of the Iconoclasts affords a pretty fair example, sufficient to show, at the very least, that oppression was not always one-sided. Moreover, it is an historic fact that a deliberate attempt was made to enslave the Catholics of the Netherlands under the pretext of liberating them from Spanish tyranny.

If evidence were wanting to prove that the independence of the northern provinces did not bring religious freedom to their inhabitants, it would be found in the statement of the Protestant historian Brandt, who wrote that—

"In Holland Calvinism was established, and a fierce persecution was waged against all dissenters, whether Catholic or Protestant. The Arminians, a Protestant dissenting sect, was condemned, although it numbered in its ranks such men as Grotius, Vorstius, Hagerbets, and Barneveldt. Grotius and Hagerbets were condemned to im-

prisonment for life and Barneveldt, although a hero of the War of Independence, was put to death, and seven hundred families of Arminians were driven into exile and reduced to beggary" (History of the Reformation in Holland).

The Spanish Inquisition Never Introduced

Divers historians have had much to say about the cruelty of the Spanish Inquisition in the Netherlands. But Professor Blok, speaking of the troubles at the beginning of Philip's reign, puts it correctly when he says that "there was some fear lest Philip might introduce the Spanish Inquisition into the provinces, something which he never thought of" (op. cit., vol. II., p. 324). The earlier laws of Charles V. were carried out by purely lay tribunals. We do not intend to minimize the rigors of Charles, Philip, or the Inquisition; but we do assert that honesty requires us invariably to discriminate between rhetorical exaggerations and sober statements of fact. Such a course is not, however, always followed in regard to the Inquisition or similar establishments. In reality, the influence of many ecclesiastics in the Netherlands was exercised, far more often than otherwise, in obtaining a modification of harsh judgments, or in saving victims from the severity of the secular courts. See, for instance, Prescott's account of Granvella's intercession in behalf of the Count of Egmont, when that foeman was on trial for treason (Philip II., Aztec ed., vol. II., p. 233).

Present Religious Status

In conclusion, a word about the religious belief of the peoples who today occupy the territories included in the Netherlands under Charles V. Belgium and northern France are now a theatre of war, so it is impossible to arrive at an estimate of the changes in population since both countries took their last census. The latest statistics are here given:

Holland (1909)	5,858,175
Belgium (1910)	7,423,784
Department of the Nord, France (1911)	1,967,780
Department of the Pas-de-Calais (1911)	1,068,155
Total	16,317,894

Belgium and France made no religious inquiries in their enumeration, but it is assumed that all but 40,000 people in Belgium, and all but 50,000 in the two French departments, were really or nominally Catholics. In Holland exact figures were obtained. Hence we have the following number of Catholics in the four present-day political divisions:

Holland (1909)	2,053,021
Belgium (est.)	7,383,784
Nord (est.)	1,937,780
Pas-de-Calais (est.)	1,048,155
	12,422,740

This figure represents 76 per cent. of the total population. It should be said, however, that these territories coincide only rather roughly with those of the old Spanish Netherlands; but for all that our statistics reflect accurately enough the extent of the Reformation's influence upon their people. Nearly all the non-Catholics of the Low Countries are in the present kingdom of Holland, and are divided as follows: Dutch Reformed (Calvinists), 2,588,267; other Protestants, 746,186; Jansenists, 10,082; Jews, 106,309; other or no creed, 353,158. The ratio of Calvinists to other Protestants still shows the greater influence of that sect three hundred years ago.

XXI.

The Reformation in England

A fairly complete history of the Reformation in England has not yet been written. In the first place, the vast collections of official and other documents bearing upon the period have been sifted only in part, and in the second, the English historians of the past were absolutely under the influence of such writers as Foxe, Strype, and the Anglican Bishop Burnet. Even now, a century of criticism has not been able entirely to banish the effects of anti-Catholic tradition, though each succeeding day sees the walls of the citadel of historic truth made more impregnable by the labors of conscientious scholars. Hence accurate, if not complete, accounts of the English Reformation are not wanting to the students of our own time.

In the third paper of this series was briefly discussed the teaching of Wyclif and the Lollards, and its effect on ante-Reformation England.* Since there were no other strong heretical agencies then at work, we come at once to the reign of Henry VIII., and, as an introduction, we shall refute the traditional view that the English Reformation was an effort to shake off medieval tyranny and purify doctrine. That nowhere has the real condition of things been presented more clearly is our excuse for quoting at length from Mr. Lilly's "Claims of Christianity," pp. 199-203:

Falsity of the Traditional View

"The tradition dominant in this country (England) for three centuries represented the Anglican Reformation . . . to have been wrought for the sake of doctrine. Thus Johnson defined the word Reformation as 'the change of religion from the corruptions of Popery to the primitive state,' and our popular histories have been the vehicles and mouthpieces of that belief. . . . Englishmen were taught from their childhood to talk of Henry VIII. as 'bluff,' of Elizabeth as 'good,' of the Reformers as 'glorious,' of Cran-

*See pages 22 and 23.

mer, in particular, as 'honest,' of Mary I. and Bonner as 'bloody'; of the religious changes of the sixteenth century as 'happy'; of the thousand years England passed in Catholic unity as 'the dark times of Popish superstition.'

"The day, we may well hope, is now fairly over when this view would be put forward by any writer of repute. The actual facts, so long buried under a mass of misconception and fable, have to a very great extent been brought to light, and established beyond the possibility of doubt. The guides so long unquestionably followed (Foxe, Strype, Burnet, etc.) have been effectually discredited . . .

"The general result is that the old Protestant tradition has almost completely disappeared.* In the early years of the (nineteenth) century Lord Macaulay, writing in the Edinburgh Review, declared that the Reformation in England 'sprang from brutal passion,' and was 'nurtured by selfish policy'; that the 'bluff' monarch who originated it was a 'shameless tyrant'; that 'of those who had any important share in bringing it about, Ridley was, perhaps, the only person who did not consider it a mere political job'; and in a few pages, perhaps among the most masterly which ever came from his pen, disposed, finally, of the pretensions to honesty made in behalf of the singular martyr (Cranmer) who 'rose into favor by serving Henry in the disgraceful affair of his first divorce'; who . . . was 'equally false to political and religious obligations'; who 'conformed backwards and forwards as the king changed his mind'; and who 'died solely because he could not help it,' 'never retracting his recantation until he found he had made it in vain,' and that he could not succeed in purchasing 'by another apostasy the power of burning men better and braver than himself.' These utterances aroused much consternation at the time, and were regarded, very generally, as little better than flat blasphemy. They are now the commonest of commonplaces. . . . If any fact of history is certain it is this: that in the ecclesiastical change wrought by Henry VIII. no religious motive had place. Lust of woman,

*Nevertheless, it enjoys an occasional revival, but only among the uninformed.

lust of lucre, lust of power, were Henry's sole springs of action. The Catholic creed he left as it was, merely detaching the Church in England from Catholic unity, and proclaiming himself its Supreme Head."

Accession of Henry VIII.

Henry VIII. was born June 28, 1491, and succeeded to the throne in 1509. "The young king," says Wyatt-Davies, "seemed to represent in his person both the glories and the evils of the Renaissance, the splendor of its achievement in the development of men's intellectual and artistic powers, together with the heartless gratification of the basest passions" (History of England, p. 201). We have already seen Henry's part in the Continental wars;* indeed, from the first he had endeavored to pursue what we should call a strong foreign policy. Luther's outbreak affected England but little; Henry, however, true to his interest in all European affairs, entered the lists against the German heresiarch, and published in 1521 his "Assertio Septem Sacramentorum," or Defense of the Seven Sacraments, for which Pope Leo X. conferred on him the title, "Defender of the Faith."† So far, the king seemed to be an exemplary Catholic, though in reality, long before this he had been unfaithful to his marriage vows.

Catherine of Aragon

Henry's queen was the noble and virtuous Catherine of Aragon, who had been married to his elder brother Arthur. The latter died in 1502, and it was thereupon planned to arrange a union between Catherine and the new heir to the throne. In 1504 Pope Julius II. despatched a Brief with the necessary dispensation to Ferdinand and Isabella, Catherine's parents, and later published a Bull to the same purpose. Henry VII., says Father Thurston (Cath. Encyc., vol. VII., p. 222), was trying to outwit Ferdinand in some political scheme, and the young prince Henry, on attaining the age of fourteen, was therefore made to record a formal protest against the proposed marriage. Nevertheless, after his

*Page 136.
†See page 68.

accession in 1509, he carried out the agreement. The dispensation had been regularly and canonically issued, and Henry, notwithstanding grave moral delinquencies, never pretended to hold it otherwise until 1527, when a passionate impulse to marry Anne Boleyn, a lady of the court, caused him to affect scruples as to the legitimacy of his marriage. Of the several children born to the royal couple, only one, Mary, survived. The queen herself had lost her youthful attractiveness—she was six years older than the king—and by such considerations Henry allowed his unlawful desire to grow.

Henry's Proceedings

The king, concealing the part Anne was to play in his scheme, informed his chancellor, Cardinal Wolsey, of his "scruples," and asked the latter to bring them to the attention of Francis I. of France, whose support Henry desired since it was certain that the Emperor Charles V. (Catherine's nephew) would strenuously oppose the English monarch's contention. Pope Clement VII. was then besieged by the Emperor's Lutheran troops, but he was able to hear Wolsey's statements, and was not in the least affected by them. However, he consented to send Cardinal Campeggio as a special legate to try the case with Wolsey. Catherine's enemies, however, contrived to delay the proceedings in the hope of winning her consent to Henry's iniquitous plan. When at last, in May, 1529, the matter finally came to a hearing, it was evident that no decision could be reached. After a seven weeks' session, Campeggio declared an adjournment, and the case passed to Rome.

Henry was enraged at the failure, and visited his wrath upon Wolsey. In 1353 the Statute of Præmunire had been enacted, by which English subjects were forbidden to take to any foreign court cases which could be settled in English courts. The king now charged Wolsey with having violated this statute, although, if there were violation, he himself had sanctioned the chancellor's legatine proceedings. Wolsey was dismissed from office, and finally arrested by royal order in November, 1530. But whilst on the way to London he was stricken with his last illness, and

died at Leicester Abbey. Sir Thomas More succeeded him,—the first layman to hold the chancellorship.

The "Reformation Parliament"

The so-called "Reformation Parliament" had already assembled. To the office of Secretary of State was appointed Thomas Cromwell, one of Wolsey's retainers, who ingratiated himself with Henry by seconding Cranmer's suggestion that the validity of Henry's marriage be referred to the Continental universities for their opinion.* To this scheme the king assented, hoping by lavish bribery to obtain favorable answers, and thus frighten Clement VII. with threats of a general schism. But the ruse failed, so Henry looked to his Parliament for justification.

For seven years this servile Parliament continued to sit, though contrary to the well-established usage of the realm. In it Henry's chief opponents were the clergy, so, in order to coerce them, he charged all under the Statute of Præmunire on the ground that they had recognized Wolsey's legatine authority. The Convocations of Canterbury and York—the two English ecclesiastical provinces—saved themselves by paying the enormous fine of £118,800, which the king accepted on condition that they would acknowledge him to be "protector and single and supreme lord" of the Church of England. The clergy complied, but avoided formal schism only by embodying in this declaration the amending phrase of Archbishop Warham of Canterbury: "as far as the law of Christ will allow." In the same year (1531) an act was passed forbidding Annates, or the First-Fruits of bishoprics, to be paid to the Pope on receipt of bulls of appointment, etc. Besides this, Henry forced upon bishops and priests the so-called "Submission of the Clergy." Its three articles provided (1) that no new canon was to be discussed in Convocation without royal license; (2) that a committee was to review the existing canons and extinguish those which did not recognize royal prerogatives; (3) that only those canons sanctioned by the king were to be valid. In a word, Henry's legis-

*See page 90.

lation already showed a decidedly anti-papal character.

Henry Marries Anne Boleyn

In the meantime the royal marriage question was still to the fore. Sir Thomas More, who could not approve Henry's attitude, soon resigned the chancellorship, and Archbishop Warham died in 1532. The king saw his opportunity, and at once nominated his complaisant agent, Thomas Cranmer, to the vacant primatial see. As there had been no definite rupture as yet, the papal confirmation was duly obtained. Before Cranmer was consecrated, however, Henry secretly married (January, 1533) Anne Boleyn, his chaplain having apparently been deceived by the royal assurance that Clement VII. had granted a formal dispensation.

The final act in the farce was now at hand. Henry first compelled the clergy to declare against the dispensing power of the Pope, and Parliament then proceeded to pass the Statute for the Restraint of Appeals, which decreed that all matrimonial and testamentary cases were to be tried in English courts whether the Pope wished it or not. Under these provisions Cranmer cited Catherine to appear before him in May, 1533. The queen declined to recognize his competency, and he then declared her marriage with Henry invalid. Catherine, separated from her daughter Mary, was henceforth to be known only as the widow of Prince Arthur. Anne was ceremoniously crowned, although the act was manifestly displeasing to the people.

Cranmer's Decision Nullified

In July Clement VII. nullified Cranmer's decision, and pronounced against Henry a sentence of excommunication, to take effect, unless the king retracted, in the following October. But a daughter—the future Queen Elizabeth—was born to Henry and Anne in September, and the monarch at once abandoned all thought (if he ever had any) of reconciliation with the Church. Under pressure, Parliament abolished the payment of Peter's Pence and the recognition of papal dispensations, and vested in the king the right of appointment to vacant bishoprics. Cranmer's

judgment in the marriage question was formally ratified, the royal succession was decreed to continue in the children of Anne Boleyn; the Convocations of Canterbury and York rejected the Pope's spiritual authority, and the Act of Royal Supremacy was passed in 1535,—an **ex post facto** announcement, as Dr. Lee of Johns Hopkins calls it, yet one of far-reaching effect, since "it left no ground for retreat; the position so assumed must be at all hazards maintained." In part it reads: "Be it enacted by authority of this present Parliament, that the king our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, . . . and shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to the imperial crown of this realm, as well the title and style thereof, as all honors, dignities, pre-eminencies, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits, and commodities, to the said dignity of supreme head of the same Church belonging and appertaining" (26 Henry VIII., c. 1, 1535).

Repudiation of Papal Authority

A year later this act was strengthened by the passage of another, to-wit:

"An Act Extinguishing the Authority of the Bishop of Rome: If any person shall extol the authority of the Bishop of Rome, he shall incur the penalty of præmunire provided by Stat. 16 R, 2 c. 5. Every ecclesiastical and lay officer shall be sworn to renounce the said bishop and his authority, and resist it to his power, and to repute any oaths taken in maintenance of the said bishop or his authority to be void; and the refusing of the said oath, being tendered, shall be adjudged high treason" (28 Henry VIII., c. 10, 1536-7).

It is interesting to note that the judgment which H. A. L. Fisher, M. A. (Oxon) calls "the last free act of the last free Convocation of England" (Political History of England, vol. V., p. 314), was given against an expression of Lutheranism. A Gloucestershire squire named Tracy had left a will in which he ordered that no Masses be celebrated for the repose of his soul, as faith without good works was quite sufficient to merit

salvation. On May 13, 1532 this view was formally held to be heretical.

Execution of Fisher and More

Henry enforced all his repressive laws to the letter. Even before the Act of Supremacy was passed, Elizabeth Barton, a nun of Canterbury, was done to death with six priests for rebuking the king's conduct toward Catherine. Sir Thomas More and Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, were imprisoned in the Tower of London for their refusal to take the oath of the royal supremacy. Pope Paul III.* raised the latter, whilst in prison, to the cardinalate; a proceeding which angered the king to such an extent that the bishop was sent to the block, June 25, 1535, whither More followed him on July 6. Fisher and More, with fifty-two other English martyrs, were beatified by decree of Pope Leo XIII., dated December 29, 1886.

Execution of Anne Boleyn

Catherine of Aragon died, neglected and friendless, in January, 1536. At that very time Henry was encouraging a new favorite, and only four months later he caused Anne Boleyn to be brought to trial on charges of infidelity. She was speedily condemned and beheaded on May 19, and on the following day the king married Jane Seymour. Their only child—afterwards King Edward VI.—was born October 12, 1537, Jane dying two days later.

In the year 1536 the suppression of the English monasteries began. This subject is, however, of such importance that it will be treated at length in the following chapter.

*In May, 1535.

XXII.

Suppression of the English Monasteries

No pen has adequately told the debt which Europe owes to her monastic institutions. Dean Maitland, the Protestant historian of the Middle Ages, admirably summarized their activities when he wrote:

"Monasteries were beyond all price, in those days of misrule and turbulence, as places where . . . God was worshipped; as a quiet and religious refuge for helpless infancy and old age; a shelter of respectful sympathy for the orphan maiden and the desolate widow; as central points whence agriculture was to spread over the bleak hills, and barren downs, and marshy plains, and deal bread to hundreds perishing with hunger and its pestilential train; as repositories for the learning which was to be; as nurseries of art and science, giving the stimulus, the means, and the reward to invention, and aggregating around them every head that could devise, and every hand that could execute; as the nucleus of the city which in after days of pride should crown its palaces and bulwarks with the crowning cross of the cathedral. This, I think, no man can deny. I believe it is true, and I love to think of it. I hope I see the hand of God in it, and the visible trace of His mercy which is above all His works." (Dark Ages, preface).

The Protestant Canon Farrar writes: "Consider what the Church did for education. Her ten thousand monasteries kept alive and transmitted that torch of learning which otherwise would have been extinguished long before. A religious education, incomparably superior to the mere athleticism of the noble's hall, was extended to the meanest serf who wished it. This fact alone, by proclaiming the dignity of the individual, elevated the entire hopes and destiny of the race" (Hulsean Lectures, 1870, Christianity and the Race, p. 186).

A General Visitation Ordered

All these statements are quite as true of English, as of Continental monasteries. In the time of Henry VIII. they were the very bulwarks of

loyalty to the Pope, so the king proceeded to visit his wrath upon them. In 1535 a general visitation was ordered. The southern monasteries first, and then the northern, were hurriedly inspected, and unfavorable reports sent to Henry and Cromwell. In this course the visitors were acting in strict accordance with Cromwell's wishes. Historians friendly to the Reformation have made the most of the scandalous accounts of some of the visitors; but careful writers have not been so easily misled. The Protestant Professor Brewer declared of the monks "that in so large a body of men, so widely dispersed, seated for so many centuries in the richest and fairest estates of England, for which they were mainly indebted to their own skill, perseverance, and industry, discreditable manners were to be found (and what literary chiffonier, raking in the scandalous annals of any profession, cannot find filth and corruption?) is likely enough; but that the corruption was either so black or so general as party spirit would have us believe, is contrary to all analogy, and is unsupported by impartial and contemporary evidence" (Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic, vol. I., p. lxxix).

Wyatt-Davies says: "It is certain that some of the monasteries had decayed financially, and had fallen into a lax state of discipline, but of any general justification for the sweeping charges brought against monks and nuns, there is none, beyond the prejudiced reports of the visitors, against some of whom charges of grave misconduct were subsequently proved. Nevertheless, on the strength of these reports, or 'comperta,' as they were called, a bill was laid before Parliament for the suppression of all religious houses whose income was less than £200. Parliament, according to the preamble of the Act, made no attempt to verify the accusations, but, as usual, gave way before the royal will" (History of England, p. 213).

The Larger Monasteries Doomed

This Act, designed to suppress the smaller monasteries, spoke favorably of the larger ones when it declared that, "thanks be to God, Religion is right well kept and observed" in "diverse great and solemn Monasteries of this Realm."

These, however, were in their turn suppressed. Dr. Lee of Johns Hopkins aptly remarks that "the good faith of the statements (of this Act) can be judged by the subsequent destruction of the last citadels of the old faith" (Source Book of English History, p. 244).

The Act gave the monastic properties "unto the King's Majesty, and his heirs and assigns for ever, to do and use therewith his and their own wills, to the pleasure of Almighty God, and to the honour and profit of this realm" (27 Henry VIII. c. 28, 1535-6). And the King's Majesty was not slow to do his own will. The buildings were plundered and ruined, the lands bestowed on favorites, or sold for a pittance; abbots and priors were charged with treason and judicially murdered; the treasures of the churches were seized, and the dependants of the monasteries, numbering fully 75,000 at least, to say nothing of the 8,000 monks and nuns, were reduced to downright beggary.

As Dr. Lee remarks, the words of the Act of 1536 were belied by the royal knave and his satellites, for the larger monasteries fell one by one, until the few that managed to exist were abolished by another act in 1539. Thus an annual income of £2,500,000 in English money of the present day was seized, and if we add the value of the Church lands and plate, the property of the guilds, the spoliation of the great shrines like that of Our Lady of Walsingham, the plunder from the tombs of Sts. Cuthbert, Thomas á Becket, and others, we shall find that the amount of sacrilegious plunder was certainly in excess of £25,000,000.

For a full account of the suppression of the monastic houses, the reader is referred to Abbot —now Cardinal—Gasquet's admirable two-volume work, "Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries."

Wealth of Churches and Guilds Seized

The treasures of all the churches in England were seized in 1538. Works of art, great libraries, architectural monuments, all disappeared. Lord Byron, in his Elegy on Newstead Abbey—founded by Henry II. after the murder of Thomas á Becket—describes in a few words its ruin and

that of many another whose foundation-stones were laid in the Ages of Faith—

"One holy Henry reared the Gothic walls,
And bade the pious inmates dwell in peace;
Another Henry the kind gift recalls,
And bids devotion's hallowed echoes cease."

Along with the treasures of churches and monasteries went the property of the guilds, the "benefit societies of the Middle Ages." All the funds for the relief of the poor, for Masses for the dead, for educational and benevolent purposes, were swept away. Josiah Toulmin Smith, who edited and published, more than half a century ago, the reports and constitutions of many of the medieval guilds, remarks that "all the possessions of all the guilds (except what could creep out as being mere trading guilds . . .) became vested by . . . two acts in the Crown; and the unprincipled courtiers who had advised and helped the scheme gorged themselves out of this wholesale plunder of what was, in every sense, public property" (Old Crown House, p. 36).

The Rev. Augustus Jessopp, D. D., a non-Catholic clergyman, describes Henry's colossal robbery in the following graphic style:

"In the general scramble of the Terror under Henry the Eighth, and of the anarchy in the days of Edward the Sixth, . . . the monasteries were plundered even to their very pots and pans. The almshouses, in which old men and women were fed and clothed, were robbed to the last pound, the poor almsfolk being turned out into the cold at an hour's warning to beg their bread. The splendid hospitals for the sick and needy, sometimes magnificently provided with nurses and chaplains, whose very **raison d'etre** was that they were to look after the care of those who were past caring for themselves, these were stripped of all their belongings, the inmates sent out to hobble into some convenient dry ditch to lie down and die in, or to crawl into some barn or house, there to be tended, not without fear of consequences, by some kindly man or woman who could not bear to see a suffering fellow-creature drop down and die at their own door-posts" (Nineteenth Century, Mar. 1898, p. 432: "Parish

Life in England before the Great Pillage." Before the Great Pillage: same article, pp. 38-39).

Those whom misfortune had impoverished were cared for, in the spirit of true Christian charity, by the guilds as well as by the monasteries. This fact, however, availed nothing when the time of dissolution came. Of the Guild of the Holy Cross at Birmingham, founded in 1392, the Commissioners of Henry VIII. reported that "there be divers poor people found aided and suckered of the said Gild, as in money, bread, drinks, coals," whilst the later agents of Edward VI. set forth that "there be relieved and maintained upon the possessions of the same Gild (and the good provision of the Master and brethren thereof) twelve poor persons, who have their houses rent-free, and all other kinds of sustenance, as well food and apparel as all other necessaries" (John A. Fryar, English Catholic Benefit Clubs of the Middle Ages, Ecclesiastical Review, Jan. 1916, p. 15). The story can be repeated almost endlessly in regard to other similar organizations.

In dealing with the guilds we have anticipated a little, since their destruction was completed only in the following reign. Hear Dr. Jessopp again:

"The ring of the miscreants who robbed the monasteries in the reign of Henry VIII. was bad enough, but the ring of the robbers who robbed the poor and the helpless in the reign of Edward VI. was ten times worse than the first. The universities only just escaped the general confiscation; the friendly societies and benefit clubs and the guilds did not escape. The accumulated wealth of centuries, their houses and lands, their money, their vessels of silver and their vessels of gold, their ancient cups and goblets and salvers, even to their very chairs and tables, were all set down in inventories and catalogues, and all swept into the great robbers' hoard. Last, not least, the immense treasures in the churches, the joy and boast of every man and woman and child in England, who day by day and week by week assembled to worship in the old houses of God which they and their fathers had built, and whose every vestment and chalice, and candlestick and banner, organs and bells, and picture and image, and

altar and shrine they looked upon as their own, and part of their birthright—all these were torn away by the rudest spoilers, carted off, they knew not whither, with jeers and scoffs and ribald shoutings, while none dared raise a hand or let his voice be heard above the whisper of a prayer of bitter grief and agony" (Before the Great Pillage, pp. 39-40).

It is, perhaps, unnecessary to expatiate upon the religious effects of this wholesale plundering. Let us turn, then, to its educational and economical effects.

Effects on Education

It is often asserted that popular education in England owes its origin to the boy-king, Edward VI., and to his advisers. Yet we know that the "chantry priests" of pre-Reformation times, with their livings secured by the treasuries of the guilds, were the schoolmasters of medieval England, and we know, too, the work accomplished in the same field by the monasteries. We can, however, strengthen our contention by quoting a non-Catholic, Mr. Arthur Leach, who declares of pre-Reformation England that

"There is not the smallest doubt that the provision for secondary education was far greater in proportion to population during the Middle Ages than there has ever been since. Education was, if not a first charge on the endowments of the Church, at all events, a well recognized part of the duties for which the endowments were given. During the whole time, from the introduction of Christianity to the Reformation, education was an ecclesiastical concern. . . From the university to the village school, every educational institution was an ecclesiastical one, and those who governed and taught it were ecclasiastics. . . . The result was that, as the Church was ubiquitous, so education was in some form ubiquitous, if not universal. As a consequence, secondary schools were found in almost every place in which they were required" (Contemporary Review, vol. 66, p. 675). As to the number of these schools, he remarks that "the contrast between one grammar school to every 5,625 people, and that presented by the Schools' Inquiry Report, 1867, of one to every 23,750 people,

is not flattering to ourselves. In regard to secondary education, we cannot justly echo the Homeric boast that we are much better than our forefathers" (p. 684).

Mr. Leach's words are fully borne out by the statements of the then Resident Commissioner of National Education (for Ireland) in a paper read at the Belfast meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, in 1902. The author did not hesitate to assert that "it is now admitted . . . that the progress of learning in England was crippled by the action of the Reformers for nearly three centuries."

To like effect are the words of a reviewer in the Athenaeum (Aug. 9, 1902, No. 3902, pp. 184-5), who remarks that "the educational possibilities bequeathed to future generations by the Middle Ages were recklessly squandered in Reformation and subsequent times, and it would seem that in the period preceding the Reformation education in England was in a more flourishing state than at the opening of the last century."

The universities suffered because of the destruction of the monastic houses, which had formerly assisted a large number of students. Bishop Latimer is authority for the statement that there were, in 1550, "ten thousand students less than there were within these twenty years." Then, too, the effect of the destruction of great libraries can be easily imagined.

The Economic Effects

The economic effects of the Reformation under Henry VIII. and Edward VI. were broader, more disastrous, and more lasting. We have unimpeachable testimony that the laboring man was well cared for in medieval times. Keir Hardie, the well-known English Socialist and member of Parliament, who died in 1915, gives the following testimony:

"Food was cheap, wages high, and an eight-hour day the rule. It appears to have been common in those far off days to pay for Sundays and holidays when there was no work done. . . . There were eighty-six days in all (Sundays and festivals) on which no work was done. This golden age, taking Europe as a whole, lasted

from 200 to 300 years; and there were neither millionaires nor paupers in those days, but a rude abundance for all." This certainly agrees with the view of the non-Catholic author William Cobbett, who in his "Protestant Reformation" undertook to prove that the great religious upheaval better merited the name, "devastation of England, which was," he says, "at the time when this event took place, the happiest country, perhaps, that the world has ever seen." And Keir Hardie emphasizes this statement when he declares that "the Protestant Reformation, by despoiling the monasteries of their lands, the one refuge to which the needy could fly for succor, also told heavily against the poor; whilst the new gospel of individual salvation lent the sanction of religion to the selfish creed of 'each for himself,' which was just then beginning to assert itself as the dominant principle in business" (From Serfdom to Socialism, chap. v.).

Another English Socialist, Mr. H. W. May, writes to like purpose when he says that "the economic condition of the wage earners was, relatively to the general conditions of the times, far and away better and higher than it has ever since been. All records go to show that the people in the main lived a healthy and vigorous life. . . . Such people, owning their own land and instruments of production, were of necessity free economically and socially, whatever political disabilities there may have been. Men and women then enjoyed themselves, in a rough and rude fashion perhaps, but nevertheless enjoyed themselves, because the future held few terrors for them in the way of starvation and want of employment" (First of May).

Wealth and Poverty

Many Catholic writers, chief among them Cardinal Gasquet, can be cited to the same effect. The upshot is to prove that in the England of the Middle Ages there was neither overbearing wealth nor servile pauperism. "In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries," says Dr. Jessopp, "there were no squires—that is the naked truth. In the great majority of country places there were no wealthy men to be found" (Before the Great

Pillage, p. 18). That terrible class-distinction which is based upon the possession or lack of money dates from the Reformation.*

Now the newer English nobility, so-called, which has been at the bottom of much of the oppression and misgovernment of the last three centuries, can trace its origin to the freebooters who plundered the monasteries and churches and guilds at the behest of the lecherous Henry VIII. When the Welsh disestablishment bill was before Parliament, a few years ago, Lord Robert Cecil branded it as sacrilegious, whereupon the present Prime Minister, Mr. David Lloyd-George, reminded the Lords that their own estates, the confiscated lands of the Catholic Church, were themselves "steeped in the fat of sacrilege." And when the upper House, threatened with diminution of its powers, made an "appeal" to the country, the hypocrisy of the Lords was exposed by Gilbert K. Chesterton in a poem, whose lines bearing upon our present topic are to the point:

"Will you call on cross and altar! and in God's name, where were you
When the crashing walls of convents let the Tudor axes through?
Tell us of your deeds, Crusaders! Waken Ariosto's muse!
How you stood the Church's champions when the Church had land to lose—
You, the Russells, with the ashes of a hundred altars shod,
You, the Howards, with your wallets bursting with the gold of God."

And it is sober historic fact that the fortunes of the Cecils of Salisbury, the Howards of Nor-

* Vedder says in his "Reformation in Germany," p. 388: "The Reformation marks the dethronement of the ancient feudal aristocracy and the beginning of the new aristocracy of capital. . . . Nothing is sacred to an aristocracy of the moneyed class but gain. Its ethical standards were as much lower than the older as money is of less worth than a man. The old aristocracy, founded on the land, felt that they owed duties to the land and their tenants; the new aristocracy acknowledged no such obligation to anybody—it was utterly and frankly selfish. . . . Capital needed a free hand if it was to develop; the Church was a restraining hand; therefore, down with the Church!"

folk, the Russells of Bedford, and many others, had their beginning in the orgy of plunder which characterized the reign of the eighth Henry.

Debasement of the Currency

Sorely as such evils afflicted the people, to them was added another. Henry's wars demanded money after the stolen Church wealth had been squandered. So the coinage of the realm was debased to one-third its former value, and the sequel was correspondingly disastrous. A great rise in prices followed at once, and the poorer classes, unable to obtain an increase in wages, were reduced to abject poverty. Pauperism necessarily followed. Attempts were made to fix a legal scale of wages, but so great was the army of the unemployed that Parliament was obliged to give its immediate attention to what was by all odds the most serious economic problem yet encountered. Instead of dealing with the trouble humanely, the resulting law declared that any man who was idle for three days was a vagabond! And on complaint, two justices of the peace could have the letter V burned on the breast of the unfortunate, whose services then belonged to the complainant for two years. And if the victim failed to give his service for a period of two weeks, his cheek or forehead was branded with the letter S—slave—and his new bondage ended only with the end of life. A second offense of the kind was punishable with death. Be it said too, that the provision made by the law for the support of the vagabond and the slave by the master was of the same brutal stripe.

Such a law could not endure; nevertheless, its spirit passed, with perhaps a little less literal harshness, into later parliamentary acts. But is it any wonder that men stand aghast at this chapter of English history? Even Froude, whose works Cardinal Gasquet rightly calls "historical romances" (Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries, vol. I., p. 290), and who was always bitterly anti-Catholic, was obliged to sum up the fruits of the Reformation in England in the following unequivocal words:

"As to the mass of the people, hospitals were gone, schools broken up, almshouses swept away; every institution which Catholic piety had be-

queathed for the support of the poor was either abolished or suspended till it could be organized anew; and the poor themselves, smarting with rage and suffering, and seeing piety, honesty, duty, trampled under foot by their superiors, were sinking into savages. From the coast of Sussex was reported the novel and yet unheard-of crime of wrecking * * * The ancient yeomanry were perishing under the new land system; the laborers, chafing on the edge of insurrection, starved, or lived by lawlessness" (History of England, Scribner's ed., vol. V., pp. 257-8).

XXIII.

The Pilgrimage of Grace

The subserviency of the English episcopate to the king's will was anything but heroic; nevertheless, there can be no doubt that the bishops had no intention of plunging the English Church into schism. Archbisop Warham on his death-bed specifically denied any such purpose. Yet schism soon followed, as we have seen, and on April 11, 1535, Anne Boleyn's chaplain, Shaxton, was consecrated Bishop of Salisbury without the usual petition to Rome for the Bulls. This was nearly two months before Sir Thomas More's execution.

Acts like these, followed as they were by the suppression of the monasteries, aroused the people, and a formidable rebellion forthwith broke out in the northern counties. In Yorkshire the movement led by Robert Aske, and Lord d'Arcy, known as the "Pilgrimage of Grace," was at first so far successful that the Duke of Norfolk, sent to oppose the rebels, was obliged to offer a truce. Authorized by Henry, he subsequently promised the summons of a Parliament at York to hear their complaints. Relying on the king's word, Aske submitted, whereupon Henry violated his pledge, and soon the rebellion broke out anew. But this time the insurgents were easily routed, and its leaders suffered the death-penalty. Aske himself was executed, although he had tried to prevent the second uprising. Among the other victims were four abbots. The Council of the North was then established to tyrannize over the subdued districts.

A Ferocious Spirit of Revenge

Henry's barbarity in his treatment of the rebels can be learned from the royal instruction to the Duke of Norfolk: "Our pleasure is, that before you close up our banner again you shall in any wise cause such dreadful execution to be done upon a good number of the inhabitants of every town, village, and hamlet, that have offended in this rebellion, as well by the hanging of them up in trees, as by the quartering of them and the

setting up of their heads and quarters in every town, great and small, and in all such other places as they may be a fearful spectacle to all other hereafter that would practise in like manner. You shall also, without pity or circumstance, now that our banner is displayed, cause all the monks and canons that be in any wise faulty to be tied up without further delay or ceremony, to the terrible example of others."

That the duke was a leader after Henry's own heart is shown by these statements of the non-Catholic author Brooks Adams, who writes that "he (Norfolk) never wearied of boasting of his lies and of his cruelty: he wrote to assure Henry that he would spare no pains to entrap them, and would esteem no promise he made to the rebels" (Law of Civilization and Decay, p. 215).

Some New Writings

The Dublin Review for October, 1916, contains an article on a recent work, "The Pilgrimage of Grace and the Exeter Conspiracy," by Madeline Hope Dodds and Ruth Dodds. These non-Catholic authors, we are told, have treated their subject "in a fair and even judicial manner," and have demonstrated that the Pilgrimage was a movement in favor, not only of religious, but of political freedom. Thus, whilst the twelfth article of the Pilgrims' petition demanded that spiritual matters be dealt with in Convocation, to the exclusion of royal interference, it also declared that the king should not interfere in elections; that complete freedom of speech be enjoyed in the House of Commons; that additional representation in parliament be given to Yorkshire; that the House of Lords be furnished with copies of bills to be proposed. The writer in the Dublin Review justly remarks: "We cannot, therefore, think that the Pilgrims were behind their age in constitutional matters. They certainly wished England to remain Catholic; but they also desired England to be free. The Pilgrimage of Grace was, indeed, a popular movement in the best sense of the word" (p. 334).

Execution of the Poles

All who opposed the king's religious views were treated no less harshly. Margaret, Countess

of Salisbury, niece of King Edward IV., had married Sir Richard Pole, and their youngest son, Reginald, at one time enjoyed high favor with Henry VIII. Reginald left England in 1522, and when, a few years later, Henry consulted him on the subject of the royal supremacy, he wrote a book, "De Unitate Ecclesiastica," taking issue with the king's policy. Although without any Orders, he was raised to the cardinalate by Paul III., and thereafter continued his opposition to Henry's ecclesiastical innovations. Henry tried to induce the Emperor Charles V. and King Francis I. of France to send Pole back to England, but, having failed in the effort, he attacked the Cardinal's family and relatives. The Marquis of Exeter and Lord Montague Pole, the Cardinal's eldest brother, were executed in 1539, whilst his mother was sent to the Tower, and two years later was done to death without a trial.

The Bill of Six Articles

At this period there were two parties contending for the religious mastery in England. One favored wide "reforms," and was in decided sympathy with the Continental Protestants; its leading members were Cranmer, Latimer, and Cromwell. On the other hand, men like Bonner, Bishop of London, and Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, were unwilling to go farther than the rejection of the Pope's authority. Henry successively favored both views, or, to quote an apt description, his "theological position was liable to variations in accordance with his political needs." The Pilgrimage of Grace had at least this much effect: the king gradually abandoned his Lutheranizing tendencies, until finally, in 1539, Parliament passed, under royal pressure, the Bill of Six Articles, legally known as "An Act Abolishing Diversity in Opinions." After setting forth that "the King's most excellent Majesty is by God's law supreme head immediately under Him of this whole Church and Congregation of England," it proceeds to discuss and then to establish the tenets of Transubstantiation, Communion in one kind, clerical celibacy, vows, private Masses, and auricular Confession.

In the following year the king's evil genius, Thomas Cromwell, met his fate. The Six Articles marked the decline of his influence, yet he did not give over his attempts to enlist Henry's sympathy for the Lutherans. In pursuit of his plan he negotiated a marriage between the king and Anne, sister of the German Duke of Cleves. Henry, who had never seen his proposed wife until she reached England, disliked her from the first because of her lack of beauty; and, moreover, the marriage failed entirely in its purpose, which was, to strengthen the German Protestant princes against the Emperor by winning for them Henry's support. After a few months Cranmer and his fellow-bishops nullified the marriage, and Cromwell was executed. Henry then married Catherine Howard, a cousin of the Duke of Norfolk. She was brought to trial in 1542 on charges of grave misconduct, and beheaded. Her successor, Catherine Parr, the king's sixth wife, survived him.

In the last few years of the reign the religious enactments were not numerous. The most important, perhaps, were (1) a royal letter, written October 4, 1541, ordering the bishops to destroy the shrines in their cathedrals, and (2) a parliamentary act (1542-43) forbidding the Bible to be read in any church. It further provides that "if any spiritual person shall teach, preach, or maintain anything contrary to the king's instructions or determinations made or to be made, and shall be thereof convict, he shall for the first offense recant, for his second abjure and bear a fagot, and for his third shall be adjudged an heretic, and be burned, and lose all his goods and chattels."

When Henry VIII. died the English Church was in schism through his fault. It had become the veriest creature of the Crown. All who opposed the royal supremacy, and all who rejected the old Catholic doctrines which Henry retained, were alike persecuted, so there is much to the remark that "those who were against the Pope were burned, and those who were for him were hanged." Nevertheless, it must not be forgotten that Henry's laws weighed by far the most heav-

ily upon Catholics, since the followers of Luther and the other Continental "reformers" were relatively few. "If ever," says Father Herbert Thurston, S. J., "a moral and religious cataclysm was the work of one man, most assuredly the first stage of the Reformation in England was the work of Henry VIII. One could wish we knew that the sense of his own personal responsibility for the evils he deplored had come home to him before the hour when, on January 28, 1547, he was summoned to his account."

Accession of Edward VI.

In his will Henry VIII. named as his successor his son Edward, who accordingly came to the throne at the age of nine years. The Earl of Hertford became Lord Protector as Duke of Somerset, and the Protestant party, favored by Archbishop Cranmer, thus gained the upper hand in the royal council. The work of Edward's reign may be summed up in these few words of the Anglican Bishop Short:

"The Church of England first ceased to be a member of the Church of Rome during the reign of Henry VIII., but it could hardly be called Protestant till that of Edward VI. . . . During the short reign of Edward VI. it became entirely Protestant" (History of the Church of England, p. 593).

The doctrines laid down in the Six Articles were now definitely abandoned. In 1548 "an Act for the Uniformity of Service and Administration of the Sacraments throughout the Realm" notes the appointment of Cranmer and some of his fellows to regulate religious rites, the framing of the Book of Common Prayer, etc. In the preceding year it was ordained by Parliament "that the . . . most Blessed Sacrament (of the Eucharist) be hereafter commonly delivered and administered unto the people within the Church of England and Ireland, and other the King's dominions, under both kinds, that is to say, of bread and wine, except necessity otherwise require."

The Fall of Somerset

In 1549 the extortionate demands of those who had acquired the monastic lands caused a rebellion in Norfolk, whilst at about the same time the

people of Devon and Cornwall rose against the religious innovations. The leaders called for the restoration of the Mass and the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament ("We will have the Sacrament hang over the altar, and there to be worshipped"—fourth article of the Devonshire insurgents),* the appointment of Cardinal Pole to a place in the royal council, and the suppression of the new version of the Bible. With the aid of German mercenary troops the rebels were speedily crushed. Their attempt, however, had one result: Somerset's public career came to an end, and in October, 1549, he was sent to the Tower.

Yet his fall brought no relief. Bishops like Bonner and Gardiner, who opposed the coercive policy and the new religious decrees, were imprisoned, whilst another system of robbery fattened upon episcopal lands and revenues. Protestant preachers from the Continent entered the country in large numbers, and with them came the tenets of Calvinism. In 1550 the altars were removed from all the churches, chalices and ciboria were carried off, the libraries of the University of Oxford were sacked, and the liturgy again changed to justify the violent repudiation of every vestige of the old faith. The new rites were then secured by another Act of Uniformity.

Mary Tudor Becomes Queen

Dudley, Earl of Warwick, who had succeeded Somerset as Lord Protector, sent the latter to the block in January, 1552, and exchanged his own former title for that of Duke of Northumberland. The king's health had been failing gradually, so the duke suggested, ostensibly in the interest of Protestantism, that Edward's half-sisters, Mary and Elizabeth, be set aside, and Lady Jane Grey (Northumberland's daughter-in-law), named to succeed to the throne. This was done, and a few months later the young king died. Northumberland's plans, however, speedily came to naught. He proclaimed Jane queen, and attempted to seize Mary, but failed; and was at once arrested. With two other conspirators he was sentenced to death, with Mary's reluctant approval, and in his last hours returned to the old

*In the medieval English churches, it was customary to have tabernacles in the form of doves, which were suspended above the altar.

Church. Lady Jane suffered the same fate only as the result of a second attempt against Mary in 1554, when the Duke of Suffolk, Sir Thomas Wyatt, and others, organized uprisings in several parts of England.

Mary devoted herself to the religious difficulties, and set about reconciling England with Rome. Bonner, Gardiner, Heath, Day, Tunstall, and the other bishops who had fallen under the displeasure of Edward VI.'s government were restored to their sees. Then the several acts of the boy-king's parliament were repealed, the bishops appointed under them were deprived of their posts, Cranmer's judgment pronouncing invalid the marriage of Henry VIII. and Catherine of Aragon was nullified, and Cranmer himself sent to the Tower on a charge of treason. Cardinal Pole was appointed papal legate, and, after Mary's marriage to Philip II. of Spain, landed in England and completed the work of reconciliation.

The Marian Prosecutions

In 1555 and 1556 occurred the prosecutions of the Protestants which have earned for Mary, at the hands of the victims' apologists, the sobriquet "Bloody." The traitorous conduct of many protagonists of the Edwardine innovations must not be forgotten in judging the causes of the queen's severity. It was not an uncommon thing, for instance, to hear prayers for Mary's death publicly offered. Besides, the royal council, presided over by Philip, was undoubtedly predisposed to harshness. Latimer, Ridley, Ferrar, and Hooper, all persons of pronunced Calvinistic tendencies who had supported the attempt to enthrone Lady Jane Grey, were burnt at the stake in 1555, and Cranmer met the same fate in the following year. In all, about 260 or 270 persons were executed.

Since practically every historical text-book written by a non-Catholic has made the most of Mary's proceedings, and held her up to scorn as a cruel and bloodthirsty tyrant, we will quote at length the judicious treatment of this subject by E. Wyatt-Davies:

"The terrible deeds of the last four years of Mary's reign have blackened her memory in the eyes of posterity, and attached to her name a

cruel epithet. But these matters cannot be judged from the standpoint of today. For, in the first place, it is certain that Mary's disposition, in spite of all the embittering experiences of her early life, did not lean to harshness. Her magnanimous treatment of the conspirators at the beginning of her reign, and of those who had harassed and humiliated her in the reigns of her father and brother, shows a loftiness of character without a parallel at the time. Of the integrity of her conduct, her kindness to her dependents and to the poor, there is ample proof. But in Mary's mind the Reformation was associated with outrages on all that she held sacred. It had begun with the rupture of the bond of marriage between her father and mother, which branded Mary herself as illegitimate. It had forced on the nation the denial of the papal authority, a belief which to Englishmen was co-eval with their Christianity, and it had ended in an orgy of rapine and profanity under Edward VI. And, in the second place, Mary necessarily shared the universal belief of her time, that it was the duty of the civil power to put down erroneous doctrine, a belief held by Protestants as well as Catholics. Thus Calvin burnt the Socinian Servetus; Cranmer sent Anabaptists to the stake, and in the code of ecclesiastical discipline, which he drew up under Edward VI., belief in Transubstantiation and the papal supremacy was to be punished as heresy. Two centuries had yet to pass before men could realize the cruel futility of religious persecution. Moreover, recent writers have acquitted Gardiner and the bishops of personal cruelty in dealing with heretics, and justice has even been done to the rough but not unkindly Bonner, whom Fox, the Protestant martyrologist, specially held up to obloquy. The persecution was mainly the act of the State, and it was the Council which urged on the bishops to proceed against heresy. And lastly, even if we blame Mary and her advisers, in justice it must be remembered that some at least of the Protestant martyrs were guilty of treason, and that others drew down upon themselves the penalties of heresy by the hideous profanity of their conduct. Men who parodied the beliefs of the majority of their fellow-countrymen inevitably provoked a

spirit of reprisal, and involved the nobler spirits of their party in a common fate. Still, in spite of these considerations, the fact remains that an appalling number, variously estimated at from 250 to 300 persons, perished under the Marian persecution, and however great the errors of opinion or conduct of the Protestant martyrs, no one would refuse a tribute of respect to the courage with which they met their terrible punishment" (History of England, pp. 229-230).

End of Her Reign

Mary's brief and troubled reign was now drawing to a close. The French king, Henry II., had aided the conspirators against her, and Philip II. had induced her to join in his war against France. This step displeased Pope Paul IV., who also deprived Cardinal Pole of his legatine powers, and called him to Rome. The French war was disastrous to England. The climax came with the capture of Calais by the Duke of Guise in January, 1558.* Before the year had ended, Mary answered the summons of death in the early morning of November 17, and twelve hours later her kinsman and adviser, Cardinal Pole, the last Catholic Archbishop of Canterbury, also laid down the burden of an eventful and stormy life. England was officially, and, for the most part in reality, a Catholic country again.

*See page 140.

XXIV.

The Accession of Elizabeth

Mary's successor and half-sister, Elizabeth, was twenty-five years old when she ascended the English throne. In the preceding reign she had ostensibly been a Catholic; but even before her coronation she gave evidence of strong Protestant sympathies. Whilst she continued to assist at Mass, she forbade the elevation of the Host in her presence, and ordained that the existing ceremonies were to be valid only until Parliament could hold a consultation. Meantime, the clergy were forbidden to preach. The bishops thereupon refused to take an active part in the queen's coronation, the single exception being Oglethorpe of Carlisle, who consented to officiate only on condition that the entire Catholic rite was used in the function. Elizabeth did not object, and was crowned on January 15, 1559.

Her Act of Uniformity

She then threw off the mask, and allied herself with the Protestant party. In the same year was passed the Act of Uniformity, which decreed severe penalties against anyone who, after the approaching feast of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, celebrated Mass or administered the sacraments according to the Roman rite. Bishops were no longer to be appointed by the Pope, and the monasteries established in Mary's reign were confiscated. A new Act of Supremacy provided that any person who upheld the Pope's authority should suffer the penalties of high treason on the third offense.

The Act of Uniformity was opposed in Parliament by the bishops, but it finally passed the House of Lords by the slender majority of three votes. All the bishops, except Kitchin of Llandaff, refused to take the oath of royal supremacy, and were forthwith deprived of their sees and imprisoned or exiled, until the old hierarchy was finally extinguished by the death of its members. Its last representative was Thomas Goldwell, Bishop of St. Asaph, who died at St. Sylvester's, in Rome, April 3, 1585. (See "Queen Elizabeth

and the Catholic Hierarchy," Bridgett and Knox, p. 261).

The New Bishops

After the expulsion of their rightful occupants, the sees were filled by the government. Matthew Parker was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, but, apart from the fact that only one of the officiating prelates, Hodgkin, had certainly been consecrated according to Catholic usage, the ordinal employed was that drawn up in the reign of Edward VI., and purposely excluded the doctrine of a priesthood established to offer sacrifice. Parker's consecration, from the Catholic viewpoint, was therefore invalid, and the apostolic succession was consequently broken. The controversy of a quarter of a century ago over the question of Anglican Orders is well remembered. It is here sufficient to recall that Pope Leo XIII., in 1896, decided against their validity.

Elizabeth's time was much taken up in foreign affairs. She aided the Huguenots in France, and the Calvinists in the Netherlands and Scotland, but the great Catholic reaction was then already well under way, and in consequence her foreign religious policy had, in a broad sense, no permanent results. Besides, Elizabeth was not a woman of strong religious convictions. Her course was invariably dictated by the selfish motives characteristic of her suspicious and unscrupulous nature.

Penal Laws

Pius IV. succeeded to the Papal throne shortly after Elizabeth's coronation. He pursued a conciliatory course toward her, but the queen rejected every overture. The penal laws were enforced with increasing severity, especially after the Council of Trent had expressly forbidden Catholics to assist at Protestant worship in order to avoid the penalties otherwise entailed. The priests who survived from Mary's reign were rapidly yielding to death, age, and infirmity, and the extinction of the old faith seemed certain until a seminary was established at Douai in Flanders by William Allen, afterwards Cardinal, whence a steady stream of priests entered England and revived the drooping spirits of the Catholics. The government retorted savagely.

In 1580 the Jesuits began their mission, when Fathers Robert Parsons and Edmund Campion arrived. To check the revival of the old faith, Parliament at divers times passed restrictive acts. Among other things, the reconciliation of any person to the Catholic Church involved the penalties of high treason, and the celebration of Mass was to be punished by a year's imprisonment and the payment of a sum equal to about £1600 of modern English money. It had long before been ordained that any one above sixteen years of age, who refused to attend Protestant services, was to be fined £20 for every lunar month in which he persisted in his refusal.

As Henry VIII's creed was a "diluted state-Catholicism," and Edward VI's an echo of Continental Protestantism, so, too, did Elizabeth's assume a guise of its own. The retention of bishoprics brought into prominence, by way of opposition, the Puritan sect, which was later destined to be a thorn in the side of the English monarchy. The original Puritans were Protestant clergy who had fled to Switzerland in Mary's reign, and, having there embraced Calvinism, returned to England after Elizabeth's accession with the intention of spreading the religion of Geneva. They secured considerable support, but their attack upon episcopacy drew upon them the queen's opposition. Parker had no sympathy with them, but his successor, Grindal, refused to prohibit their services, and for that reason the queen suspended his jurisdiction. Whitgift, the next Archbishop of Canterbury, again proceeded against them, and finally, in 1593, Parliament enacted that those who frequented their meeting-places might be punished with banishment or death.

It is not our purpose to follow further the tortuous development of English Nonconformity. The influence of Calvinism on the Established Church was, in the long run, inevitable; but the characteristics of the Elizabethan Establishment may be summed up in the statement that it held a politic blend of Lutheran and Calvinistic doctrines with the episcopal form of government (under State control, of course), and a shadow of the old ceremonial. It was an admirable reflection of the queen's lack of definite religious views.

Odious Comparisons

We will now devote a brief time to Elizabeth's religious persecutions. As has already been remarked, non-Catholic historians are fond of holding Mary Tudor up to scorn as the great exemplar of intolerance, whilst Elizabeth's crimes are glossed over or entirely excused. An excellent example of the common method of dealing with the two sisters is afforded by Roscoe Lewis Ashley's "Medieval Civilization: A Textbook for Secondary Schools," the author of which teaches history in the public high school of our neighboring city of Pasadena. The book was published only last year (1916). Says Mr. Ashley, sententiously:

"On Edward's death Mary Tudor, daughter of Henry VIII. and Catherine of Aragon, became queen. She brought back the Catholic service and persecuted those that would not conform to this older and more conservative religion. She was distrusted by the people because she married Philip II. of Spain; she was disliked because she burned many prominent men at the stake, thus gaining the name 'Bloody Mary.'

"On Mary's death her half-sister Elizabeth, daughter of Anne Boleyn, came to the throne. Elizabeth arranged for a compromise religion, which was really Protestant, based on the 'Thirty-nine Articles.' She did not enforce her religious laws very strictly, because she wished to be the real ruler of all her people, Catholics as well as Protestants, and the real head of both Church and state" (p. 590).

Fines and Penalties

The statement that Elizabeth "did not enforce her religious laws very strictly" is true only in a qualified sense, and for the first ten years of her reign. After that, Catholics were treated with severity, as we shall now proceed to show.

First, as to fines and like penalties, we learn that in the earlier half of the year 1601, the English Treasury received the sum of £9,226 19s 4d., —an amount which, since the currency of that time had about one-twelfth the value of the money of today, would mean something like £111,000, or $550,000 in American money (Gasquet, Old English Bible, essay X., p. 353).

Again: "Certain poor Catholics who were unable to pay the heavy fines imposed upon them for neglecting to attend the public service of the Church . . . had been publicly whipped through the city" (Milner, History of Winchester, vol. I., p. 380). This was in 1583.

In 1584 the Clerk of the Peace in Hampshire declared "that at every session the indictments against the Recusants are in number seven score at the least," and "almost all other causes and grievances of the shire have to be omitted, as the justices are occupied by them" (State Papers, Dom. Eliz., vol. 183, No. 83. Quoted by Father Hornyold, S. J., "Faith of Old England," p. 106).

Secondly, as to executions: "In 1577 Cuthbert Mayne was the first of the seminarist priests to suffer martyrdom, and from this time till the end of the reign the penal laws were steadily augmented in number and were severely enforced" (Wyatt-Davies, History of England, p. 243).

"No special pleading in the world, no attempt to extenuate the acts done on the ground that they were called for by the exigencies of the hour, can alter the fact that, for the last twenty years of Elizabeth's reign, torture of the most revolting kind was habitually employed upon wretched men and women, who one after another declared they prayed for her as their queen, but they could not, they dared not, accept the creed she attempted to impose upon them" (Dictionary of National Biography, vol. VI., pp. 636-7, art. "Elizabeth").

Apropos, William Cobbett writes:

"It is impossible for us not to reflect with shame on what we have so long been saying against the Spanish Inquisition, which from its first establishment has not committed so much cruelty as this first Protestant queen committed in any single year of the forty-three years of her reign. And observe again and never forget, that Catholics, where they inflicted punishments, inflicted them on the ground that the offenders had departed from the faith in which they had been bred, and which they had professed; whereas the Protestant punishments have been inflicted on men because they refused to depart from the faith in which they had been bred, and which they had professed all their lives. And in the par-

ticular case of this brutal hypocrite, they were punished, and that, too, in the most barbarous manner, for adhering to that very religion which she had openly professed for many years of her life, and to which she, even at her coronation, had sworn that she belonged.

"It is hardly necessary to attempt to describe the sufferings that the Catholics had to endure during this murderous reign. No tongue, no pen is adequate to the task. To hear Mass, to harbor a priest, to admit the supremacy of the Pope, to deny this horrid virago's spiritual supremacy, and many other things which an honorable Catholic could hardly avoid, consigned them to the scaffold, and to the bowel-ripping knife. But the most cruel of her acts, even far more cruel than her butcheries, because of far more extensive effect, and far more productive of suffering in the end, were the penal laws inflicting fines for recusancy; that is to say, for not going to her new-fangled Protestant church. And was there ever tyranny equal to this? Not only were men to be punished for not confessing that the new religion was the true one, not only for continuing to practise the religion in which they and their fathers and their children had been born and bred, but also punished for not actually going to the new assemblages, and there performing what they must, if they were sincere, necessarily deem an act of open apostasy and blasphemy! Never in the whole world was there ever heard of before tyranny equal to this" (History of the Reformation, pp. 279-280).

Elizabeth's Lack of Conviction

It is beyond cavil, then, that Mr. Ashley's assertion that Elizabeth "did not enforce her religious laws very strictly," is not historically correct. However, since we insist upon a fair treatment of Mary's reign, we shall show the same consideration to Elizabeth. Let us again remark, therefore, that the latter was a person of no pronounced convictions. Indeed, the non-Catholic John R. Green says that "no woman ever lived who was so totally destitute of the sentiment of religion" (Short History of the English People, p. 369). It cannot, then, be consistently alleged that the Elizabethan persecutions were carried

out in the interests of religious reform. On the contrary, the queen's motives were altogether political. Cardinal Gasquet writes:

"To do Elizabeth justice, it could hardly have entered her mind to suppose that the English people, or any considerable section of them, would finally question the royal right to settle the legal basis of the national creed" (Old English Bible, pp. 320-1), and this, of course, because the Protestant principle, "cujus regio, ejus religio," she regarded as having been well established in England.

In the Marian proscriptions there were, for the most part, well-founded charges of treason. Elizabeth, on the contrary, was not opposed by a rival claimant when her own time to ascend the throne came. To solidify her power, the "Virgin Queen" wanted religious uniformity of her own making, and thus the profession of the Catholic faith became treason. Catholics had given no other ground for complaint. Hallam writes:

"It cannot, as far as appears, be truly alleged that any greater provocation had as yet been given by the Catholics than that of pertinaciously continuing to believe and worship as their fathers had done before them" (Const. Hist. of England, Crowell's "Standard" ed., vol. I., p. 123).

In fine, whatever the provocations Mary had (and they were many), Elizabeth at the beginning of her reign certainly had none.

But, it is sometimes said, the subsequent disloyal conduct of Catholics justified Elizabeth's severity. If this saying were true, it were a word of praise for the punishment of a fault by the maker of the fault. Doubtless a few Catholics were made desperate by ill-treatment. Let us quote Hallam again:

"It is my thorough conviction that the persecution, for it can obtain no better name, carried on against the English Catholics, however it might serve to delude the Government by producing an apparent conformity, could not but excite a spirit of disloyalty in many adherents to that faith" (op. cit., vol. I., p. 130).

Her Excommunication

However this may be, it is certain that Popes Pius IV. (1559-1566) and St. Pius V. (1566-1572) showed no lack of good-will toward Elizabeth, and it was only when no hope remained, that the latter Pontiff issued the Bull **Regnans in Excelsis** (February 26, 1570), deposing and excommunicating the queen. In the Bull Elizabeth's government at last got hold of a pretext for treating Catholics as traitors. The act of Pius V. marks one of the last attempts, on the part of the Holy See, to assert the much-discussed deposing power so frequently exercised in the Middle Ages.

That power, apart from any purely spiritual considerations, was grounded on the medieval system of Christendom. Theoretically, that system still existed. Elizabeth at her coronation had sworn to maintain the Catholic religion, and had broken her oath; consequently, Pius V., true to the old constitution of Europe, attempted to exercise the deposing power for the welfare of the Christian world; and who, having due regard to his ideal, shall say that he was wrong? Nevertheless, his action was politically unfortunate, since the old system, theoretically alive, had in reality passed away, and therefore his fulmination was certainly destined to fail of effect. One can thus understand why many writers maintain that the Protestantizing of England was in some measure due to what they call the short-sightedness of Popes Pius V., Gregory XIII., Sixtus V., and Clement VIII. A typical assertion is the following, taken from Dr. T. Dunbar Ingram's work, "England and Rome":

"The conversion of a minority of the English people into a Protestant majority was effected by the Popes of Rome and their emissaries" (p. 314).

On the other hand, conditions were such that the Popes could not remain silent and be true to the duties of their office. The results, however unhappy, cannot in justice be ascribed to their action, but should rather be charged to the bad will of the English queen and her government.

After Elizabeth

A few words will conclude these considerations of the Reformation in England.

James I., Elizabeth's successor, ordered his

reign upon the principle of the divine right of kings,—a doctrine wrongly held nowadays to be typical of the Middle Ages. James promulgated this monstrous theory of government in his "Remonstrance for the Divine Right of Kings and the Independency of Their Crowns,"—maintained against the French Cardinal Duperron,—claiming that the constitutional limits of his power were only concessions which he had made, and might at any time recall.* The Established Church adopted the royal doctrine, and preached it during all the Stuart reigns except that of the Catholic James II., when it inconsistently deserted its former principle, though the king himself maintained his great-grandfather's policy of government. It is needless to say that the Catholics of England obtained no relief under any such system. Whatever may have been the personal inclinations of James I., Charles I. and Charles II., none was strong enough in character to resist the bigotry of his ministers. The interlude of the Puritan Commonwealth (1648-1661) was even worse, and, after the dethronement of James II. in 1689 the penal laws were intensified under William and Mary. Anne, George I. and George II. all added their contribution, and, in fine, it was not until 1778, in the reign of George III. and during the American Revolution, that the first act repealing any of the former disabilities was passed. Further relaxation came in 1781-2, and again in 1793, whilst full emancipation was delayed until 1829, when the great Irishman, Daniel O'Connell, wrung from a hostile parliament the passage of the "Act for the Relief of His Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects."

At the time of the descent of the Armada on England, an enumeration showed the country to have something less than five million inhabitants. We shall not be far wrong, then, if we place the figure at four millions when Henry VIII. broke away from the Catholic Church. How well persecution and the penal laws did their work may

*The great Jesuit theologian Suarez strenuously combatted James' "divine right" theory. His work, "De Defensione Fidei," was burned by the hangman at the English sovereign's order, and was forbidden to be circulated by command of the Parliament of Paris.

be seen in the returns made to the House of Lords in 1778, when the number of Catholics in England and Wales was found to be only 69,376. The present figure, due largely to Irish immigration and to conversions, is not far from 2,000,000. The hierarchy was re-erected by Pius IX. in 1850, and now numbers four metropolitan and twelve suffragan sees, with the announcement just at hand that another is about to be added.*

*This new diocese will have its see at Brentwood, and will be known by that name.

XXV.

The Reformation in Ireland: The Reign of Henry VIII.

The English civil wars of the fifteenth century weakened the alien rule in Ireland, and in the earlier part of the reign of Henry VIII. the English Pale consisted only of the counties of Dublin, Wexford, Westmeath, Wicklow, and about half of Louth. In furtherance of his despotic plans Henry resolved to assert the power of the Crown against the great Irish chiefs, and began by recalling and imprisoning the Lord Deputy, Earl Gerald of Kildare, in 1534. This act led to revolt on the part of the earl's son, Lord Thomas Fitzgerald, but the rising failed, and Thomas and his five uncles were executed in 1537.

With Gerald's deposition were introduced the king's religious novelties. An apostate monk, George Browne, was made Archbishop of Dublin, and when a parliament was convened, some two years later, the new Lord Deputy, Leonard Grey, exacted from it a declaration of the king's supremacy over the Irish Church, and an order for the confiscation of monasteries. The proctors who had always represented the several Irish dioceses were excluded from this parliament. Five bishops agreed to acknowledge the royal supremacy; but the number of priests who followed their example throughout Ireland could be counted on one's fingers. The support of the nobles was secured by the usual promise of liberal shares in the plunder.

In 1541 Henry formally assumed the title, King of Ireland. Hitherto the English monarchs had been merely "Lords of Ireland," and the change was made quite as much to annoy the Pope as to add to the royal prerogatives. Nevertheless, at the time of Henry's death virtually no progress had been made in the attempt to force the Reformation on Ireland.

Under Henry's Successors

The deputy of Edward VI., Anthony St. Leger, introduced the Book of Common Prayer, and when the bishops refused to accept it, they were

at once deprived of their sees. All these acts were accompanied by manifestations of racial antagonism. Mary Tudor, in her turn, restored Catholic worship, but inflamed the national feeling anew by the creation of two new counties, King's and Queen's, from which the Irish were expelled to make room for an English plantation.

The reign of Elizabeth marked the reassertion of the royal supremacy, and the passage of the Act of Uniformity. A formidable rebellion, however, drew the queen's attention elsewhere. The head of the O'Neills of Ulster had been made Earl of Tyrone in 1541, and at his death the English recognized as his heir his eldest son, Matthew, against the claim of another son, Shane, who had the support of his clan. The efforts of the English to suppress Shane failed for a long time, and kept the queen's forces busy in the north. At the same time a war in the south between the followers of the Earl of Ormonde and those of the Earl of Desmond, head of the Munster branch of the Fitzgeralds, was disastrous to the latter, who, however, managed to obtain Spanish and Italian aid in the renewal of the conflict in 1580. Elizabeth's treachery toward her enemies found a field of action in this war. The Spaniards were besieged in Smerwick, where they surrendered only to be murdered in cold blood by the queen's minions. Desmond himself was killed in 1583, and the queen then attempted to plant Munster with English Protestant colonists.

Elizabeth's policy was directed against both the religion and the nationality of the Irish people. The result was a united effort to get rid of the oppressive foreign yoke. Hugh O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone, nephew and successor of Shane, rose in 1598, and defeated the English in the battle of Yellow Ford. Elizabeth thereupon sent the Earl of Essex to Ireland with a large army. He was unsuccessful, and was soon obliged to give place to Lord Mountjoy. In 1601 the Spaniards occupied Kinsale, which Mountjoy invested. Hugh O'Neill was defeated in an attempt to raise the siege; his chief ally, O'Donnell, was assassinated; and after the subjugation of Munster, Mountjoy attacked his foeman in Ulster, and devastated the

whole country.* O'Neill submitted in 1603, just after Elizabeth's death. But the latter's efforts to root out of Ireland its religion and nationality had palpably failed, notwithstanding the success of her arms.

The Reigns of the Stuarts

The Irish hoped for better things under James I., the son of the Catholic Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, but they were soon undeceived. Under the new king the Acts of Uniformity and Supremacy were sternly enforced. The death-penalty was meted out to the clergy who refused to leave the country, and the Act of Oblivion, by which those who participated in O'Neill's rebellion were supposed to have been pardoned, was speedily side-tracked. English law was declared to be in force in all parts of Ireland. Packed juries and a packed parliament found O'Neill and Rory O'Donnell, Earl of Tyrconnell, guilty of high treason. The two earls fled the country, going finally to Rome, where they died, and where their remains still rest in the church of San Pietro in Montorio. Their confiscated lands in Ulster were immediately parcelled out among Scotch Presbyterians and English Protestants, and thus a Protestant element in the north of Ireland, an element which has ever since been eminently anti-national and anti-Catholic, gained an ascendency which it has exercised for generations in the interest of alien masters.

The reign of the next king, Charles I., ended with the era of the Reformation properly so-called

---

*"The war, as conducted by Carew, by Gilbert, by Pelham, by Mountjoy, was literally a war of extermination. The slaughter of Irishmen was looked upon as literally the slaughter of wild beasts. Not only the men, but the women and children who fell into the hands of the English, were deliberately and systematically butchered. Bands of soldiers traversed great tracts of country, slaying every living thing they met. The sword was not found sufficiently expeditious, but another method proved much more efficacious. Year after year, over a great part of Ireland, all means of human subsistence were destroyed, no quarter was given to prisoners who surrendered, and the whole population was skilfully and steadily starved to death. The pictures of the condition of Ireland at this time are as terrible as anything in human history." (Lecky, Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, vol. I., chap. I., Appleton ed. pp. 6-7.)

—1517-1648. His head rolled from the block, January 30, 1649, after a quarter century which meant for Ireland only the continuance of his father's policy of plantation, proscription, and persecution. We cannot follow the course of Irish history in detail beyond this period. It is enough for our present purpose to remark that the laws of the Commonwealth under Cromwell, and the latter's barbarous conduct in Ireland, were succeeded by no measure of relief under Charles II., whilst the overthrow of James II. after the Revolution of 1688 brought in its train the savage and intolerant penal code when William III. and Mary ascended the throne.

The Penal Code

The English rationalist Lecky may be cited as an impartial witness in reference to this code, which Protestant writers sometimes attempt to justify on the ground that the Irish Catholics had supported James against William, and were therefore regarded as traitors by the government of the latter. Lecky writes:

"It must be observed that the penal code, which began under William, which assumed its worst features under Anne, and which was largely extended under George I. and George II., was entirely unprovoked by any active disloyalty on the part of the Catholics. It is surely absurd to describe the Irish Catholics as having manifested an incurably rebellious and ungrateful disposition because, in the contest of the Revolution, they took the part of the hereditary sovereign, to whom all classes had sworn allegiance, whose title when they took up arms had not been disputed by any act of an Irish Parliament, and who . . . had at least given no provocation to the Catholics of Ireland. And, at all events, after the Treaty of Limerick had been signed, during the long agony of the penal laws, no rebellion took place" (Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, vol. I., chap. II., Appleton's ed., p. 141). A little later he adds: "In the great rebellion of 1715 not a single overt act of treason was proved against the Catholics of Ireland." It is therefore impossible to justify the penal code by any argument of political necessity.

Hear Lecky again:

"It was the distinguishing characteristic of the Irish penal code that its victims constituted at least three-fourths of the nation, and that it was intended to demoralize as well as degrade . . . In his own country the Catholic was only recognized by the law, 'for repression and punishment.' The Lord Chancellor Bowes and the Chief Justice Robinson both distinctly laid down from the bench 'that the law does not suppose any such person to exist as an Irish Roman Catholic'" (ibid. p. 146). This sounds like an echo of Tertullian's words to his fellow-Christians, persecuted by the power of imperial Rome, reminding them of the regard, or lack of it, in which they were held by Roman law: "Non licet esse vos."

Lecky continues: "A second object of the penal laws was to reduce the Catholics to a condition of the most extreme and brutal ignorance . . . The legislation on the subject of Catholic education may be briefly described, for it amounted simply to universal, unqualified, and unlimited proscription. . . . The alternative offered by law to the Catholics was that of absolute and compulsory ignorance or of an education directly subversive of their faith" (ibid. pp. 148-9).

A Strong Indictment

In fine, the penal code "was the instrument employed by a conquering race, supported by a neighboring power, to crush to the dust the people among whom they were planted. And, indeed, when we remember that the greater part of it was in force for nearly a century, that its victims formed at least three-fourths of the nation, that its degrading and dividing influence extended to every field of social, political, profsesional, intellectual, and even domestic life, and that it was enacted without the provocation of any rebellion, in defiance of a treaty which distinctly guaranteed the Irish Catholics from any further oppression on account of their religion, it may be justly regarded as one of the blackest pages in the history of persecution. In the words of Burke, 'It was a complete system, full of coherence and consistency, well digested and well composed in all its parts. It was a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted

for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man.' The judgment formed of it by one of the noblest representatives of English Toryism was very similar. 'The Irish,' said Dr. Johnson, 'are in a most unnatural state, for we there see the minority prevailing over the majority. There is no instance, even in the Ten Persecutions, of such severity as that which the Protestants of Ireland have exercised against the Catholics'" (ibid., pp. 169-170). Yet all this notwithstanding, the Reformation was not to be forced on the country. If due allowance is made for the descendants of the Protestant "colonists," who account principally for the 25 per cent of the population now Protestant, it is entirely safe to say that not two per cent of the rest of the people are other than Catholic.

XXVI.

The Reformation in Scotland

The doctrines of Luther were first preached in Scotland about the year 1525, in the reign of King James V. Here, as elsewhere, they were welcomed by a corrupt nobility seeking to enrich itself through the confiscation of ecclesiastical properties, but the government acted promptly and vigorously, and several of the disturbers were executed. Others sought refuge in England, where they found an ally in Henry VIII., who, though he persecuted Lutherans in his own kingdom, was willing to encourage them in Scotland for the sake of fomenting discord there, and so facilitating his plan to unite the northern realm with his own.

Henry's chief enemy in Scotland was Cardinal Beaton, or Betoun, Archbishop of St. Andrew's, who defended the Scottish alliance with France against the machinations of the English king. In 1542 a border raid afforded Henry a pretext for invading Scotland, whereupon James V. in his turn threw a force into England. The Scots, however, were defeated at Solway Moss, and James shortly afterward died, his end hastened by the news of disaster to his arms. His infant daughter Mary was proclaimed his successor. Henry's friends soon managed to obtain control in Scotland. Cardinal Beaton was imprisoned, and the Scottish parliament induced to sanction Henry's proposal of a future marriage between the young queen Mary and his own son Edward. But Pope Paul III., alarmed at the turn of affairs in Scotland, laid the country under interdict, and the effect upon the temper of the people soon led to Beaton's release. The marriage treaty was at once set aside, and the alliance with France renewed.

Assassination of Cardinal Beaton

In 1543 Henry in turn made an alliance with the Emperor Charles V. against the French king, and led an army against Francis I. in the following year. But Charles, after a time, deserted Henry, whose French campaign was, on the whole, rather barren of results. In his attack on his

enemy's weaker ally he was more successful. The Earl of Hertford invaded Scotland in 1544, and burnt Edinburgh, though a second English expedition met with disaster at Ancrum Muir. Meanwhile the English faction in Scotland, supported by Henry, conspired to murder Beaton. Hertford's troops destroyed churches and plundered monasteries,—acts openly approved and imitated by a Protestant preacher, George Wishart, who incited the populace to riot and treason. For this he was executed in 1546. A few weeks later a band of nobles seized the Castle of St. Andrew's, murdered Beaton, and used the castle as a stronghold whence to terrorize the surrounding country. They were finally beleaguered and captured with French aid, and borne away to France as prisoners.

John Knox

Among them was an apostate priest, John Knox, whom they had commissioned to expound the new religious doctrines, and who was destined to be the Coryphæus of the Scottish Reformation. Knox was subsequently released at the behest of the boy-king Edward VI. of England, in which country he preached during his protector's brief reign. At the accession of Mary Tudor he retired to the continent, and made his way to Geneva, where he became intimate with Calvin, a kindred spirit, whose pitiless theology he found quite to his liking, and under whose direct influence he remained until 1555. In Geneva he imbibed all of Calvin's ferocious intolerance. Hallam says that "in a conversation with Maitland he asserted most expicitly the duty of putting idolaters to death. Nothing can be more sanguinary than the Reformer's spirit in this extraordinary interview" (Const. Hist., Standard ed. vol I., p. 147, note). And Andrew Lang declares that "the very essence of Christianity is cast to the winds when Knox utters his laughter over the murder or misfortune of his opponents" (John Knox and the Reformation, p. 17).

In the meantime the English, in 1547, had again invaded Scotland. By the aid of foreign troops they were finally driven out, and a Scottish parliament was summoned to meet in 1548. The French alliance was again renewed, the regent, Arran, who had favored the Reformation, was

replaced by the young queen's mother, Mary of Guise, and the queen herself was sent to France for her education, with the understanding that she was afterward to marry the Dauphin, Francis, eldest son of King Henry II. When Mary Tudor succeeded Edward VI. in England, the Protestant party in that country was no longer allowed to send aid to the seditious minority in Scotland.

Knox, however, returned to his native land in 1555, but found himself unable to preach openly. He was therefore obliged to be content with secret propaganda, but the government soon learned of his doings, whereupon he again retired to Geneva. Among his adherents were many nobles. In 1557 these men signed an agreement (the so-called First Covenant), binding themselves to support the Protestant party, styled by its members, the "Congregation." Wherever they found themselves in power, they seized monasteries and churches, and expelled the clergy.

Encouraged by the accession of Elizabeth to the English throne, Knox returned to Scotland in 1559. He proceeded to Perth, where he incited the populace to acts of anti-Catholic vandalism. The cathedral was pillaged and destroyed, as was also the abbey of Scone, the coronation-place of the Scottish kings. The half-brother of the young queen, Lord James Stuart, joined the Protestant movement, another addition to which was obtained in the person of the powerful Earl of Argyle. A formidable insurrection followed. The nobles' army, after a campaign of pillage and destruction, captured Edinburgh, plundered and wrecked its churches, and seized the royal treasury.

Meantime Mary Stuart, the young Queen of Scots, had married the Dauphin, whom the death of Henry II. brought to the French throne as Francis II., in 1559, just before the nobles' uprising. Francis promptly sent troops to the aid of his mother-in-law, and with their assistance the regent regained the capital without delay.

This reversal of their fortunes caused the rebels to seek assistance beyond the Scottish frontier. Accordingly, in February, 1560, Lord James Stuart entered into an alliance with Elizabeth. An army and a fleet were immediately sent to Scotland, and war followed, during which the

regent died. After a few months, peace was made at a meeting of commissioners representing Elizabeth on the one hand, and Francis II. and Mary Stuart on the other; but the envoys of the Scottish sovereign exceeded their authority by granting complete amnesty to the rebels and sanctioning the convocation of a parliament without royal decree. The Protestant lords therefore looked upon the issue as a victory for them, as indeed to a large extent it was.

The parliament which met without the sanction of the Crown, and therefore illegally, lost no time in showing its sympathy with the Protestant rebels. The constitutional rights of the clergy were first of all set aside. Then the Lords of the Articles—all Protestants—introduced and carried through a Calvinistic profession of faith. Next, the spiritual authority of the Pope was rejected, the saying or hearing of Mass was forbidden under penalty of death for the third offense, and finally, all Church property was confiscated.

Mary's Return

After the death of her husband, Francis II., Mary Stuart returned to Scotland to rule in person over her turbulent domain. In 1565 she married her cousin, Lord Darnley, and proclaimed him king; since Darnley was a Catholic, the Protestant nobles manifested much opposition, which Mary met with a decree granting religious liberty to the objectors on the condition that they ceased to molest Catholics. This measure did not satisfy the nobles, who attempted a rising under the protection of Elizabeth. Mary's half-brother, who had become Earl of Murray, and in whose hands she had left the affairs of government, was the leader of this attempt, which failed through the loyalty of Mary's troops. Murray then betook himself to England.

The queen's marriage with Darnley proved disastrous. A worthless profligate, he joined in a conspiracy to murder Mary's secretary, David Rizzio, to which Murray and the Earl of Morton were parties. Rizzio was done to death in the queen's presence on March 9, 1566. An attempt to imprison the queen herself failed. Knox, who had meantime been declaiming against "Popery,"

fled to a place of safety when Mary returned to Edinburgh at the head of eight thousand men.

The queen again rashly placed her confidence in Murray, and also received into favor the Earl of Bothwell, Darnley's enemy. Morton and his fellow-conspirators were pardoned at the behest of these two. Murray and his party then plotted Darnley's death, and the young king was murdered, February 10, 1567. Bothwell was charged with the crime, brought to trial, and acquitted. The trial itself was a farce; but its outcome was sanctioned by Parliament.

A New Conspiracy

A party of nobles, some of whom had been involved in the conspiracies against both Rizzio and Darnley, next entered into a new one against Bothwell; and then, the better to carry out their plan for the queen's destruction, recommended that she marry Bothwell. The queen, however, refused to consider such a step, but Bothwell, at the head of an armed force, seized her whilst on a journey, and, after holding her a captive at Dunbar for several days, brought her a prisoner to Edinburgh, where she was forced to marry him with Protestant ceremonial.

Bothwell's enemies then threw off the mask, and raised troops to attack him. The opposing forces met at Carberry Hill, where the traitorous nobles won the day. Mary surrendered on condition that the rebels should acknowledge her as their sovereign. The promise was given, only to be broken. Mary was taken to Loch Leven Castle, where, under threats of death, she was compelled to abdicate in favor of her infant son, James VI., and to appoint Murray regent. After the battle of Carberry Hill Bothwell had been allowed to escape, and this fact shows conclusively that the whole conspiracy was aimed at the queen alone.

Mary's enemies had openly charged her with complicity in Darnley's murder, and her subsequent forced marriage to Bothwell was then skilfully used to inflame public opinion against her. Bothwell died in 1578, a prisoner of Frederick II. of Denmark, leaving behind him a written statement which is decisive as to Mary's innocence of the plot against Darnley.

After nine months in Loch Leven Castle Mary

escaped, and with the aid of the Hamiltons raised a force for her defense. But Murray routed her troops near Glasgow, and the queen fled into England, throwing herself on the generosity of Elizabeth. The latter ordered her royal kinswoman to be detained, and on May 19, 1568, Mary became Elizabeth's prisoner,—a bondage which ended only with her execution at Fotheringay, February 8, 1587.

Triumph of the "Reformers"

With Mary's disappearance from the stage of Scottish history, treason and the Reformation triumphed in that rugged northern land. Here again we find no vestige of a popular movement in favor of Protestantism. The whole miserable affair was the work of avaricious nobles, and notwithstanding the severity of the laws against the clergy, and the extinction of the hierarchy, the old faith lingered for decades. But it was starved out at last, and Calvinism reigned in its stead. Only then were their teachers able to instill that hatred for the ancient religion which was so long a characteristic of Scottish Protestantism. The narrative is indeed a graceless one. The quotation from the Protestant Professor T. York Powell, already given, may be repeated with effect here:

"The whole story of Scottish Reformation, hatched in purchased treason and outrageous intolerance, carried on in open rebellion and ruthless persecution, justified only in its indirect results, is perhaps as sordid and disgusting a story as the annals of any European country can show" (Fortnightly Review, vol. 74, p. 217).

The regent Murray was assassinated in 1570, and Lennox, who succeeded him, set about getting rid of Mary's friends. One of the most loyal of these was Cardinal Beaton's successor in the see of St. Andrew's—John Hamilton. After a farcical trial, Archbishop Hamilton was hanged in his pontificals at Stirling, April 5, 1571. The remaining members of the old chapter elected Robert Hay in his stead, but Hay was never consecrated, and the see remained vacant for three hundred and seven years. Archbishop Beaton of Glasgow and Bishop Leslie of Ross died in France, whither many Scottish ecclesiastics had

retired. John Knox's career ended November 24, 1572, but his work of proscription went on. The remaining bishops were outlawed in 1574. Catholics were required to subscribe to the Presbyterian confession of faith, and to receive communion in the same manner. James VI. himself, in 1581, signed a profession of Protestantism, and from that time all hope of a return to the old religion of the land was destroyed.

The rapid growth of Catholic interests in Scotland in the nineteenth century led to plans for the revival of the hierarchy. At last Leo XIII., only twelve days after his election to the Chair of Peter, by the Bull **Ex Supremo Apostolatus Apice** restored hierarchical organization to the Church in Scotland. There are now two archiepiscopal sees, St. Andrew's and Edinburgh, and Glasgow. The former has the four suffragan sees of Aberdeen, Dunkeld, Galloway, and Argyll and the Isles; the latter is without suffragans. The present Catholic population is approaching 600,000, in a total of something less than 5,000,000.

XXVII.

The Reformation in Poland: Socinianism

In the early ages of Christianity the peace of the Church was repeatedly disturbed by heresies touching the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The Sabellians, Macedonians, and Arians all attacked this fundamental dogma at one point or another, their views converging upon the denial of distinction of Persons in the Godhead. Whilst these several heresies in time practically disappeared, certain medieval teachers like Abelard held opinions which gave rise to a sect whose members were called Tritheists. Unsound speculation was thus kept alive, and it is not surprising that it again asserted itself, though not in its medieval form, at the time of the Reformation.

The sixteenth-century "reformers" who rejected the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity were real Antitrinitarians; that is to say, they denied the distinction of Persons, and thus they followed Arius and Macedonius rather than the Nominalists of Abelard's time. The most prominent of the Antitrinitarian bodies of the Reformation period were the Socinians, so called from their leader, Fausto Sozzini (Faustus Socinus) of Siena in Italy, whose uncle, Lelio Sozzini, a priest, had been connected wth an Antitrinitarian society at Vicenza in 1546. This society soon disbanded; but some of its members repaired to Cracow, in Poland, where meetings were resumed.

Socinus' Creed

In 1579 Faustus himself repaired to Cracow, and found its erstwhile Antitrinitarian congregation split into half a dozen factions. After meeting with much resistance, he made himself master of the situation, and thereupon began to persecute those who differed from his views. He taught that Christ, though not God, was to be adored; that the Bible was the sole rule of faith, though only insofar as its teachings could be reconciled with, or rather interpreted by, human reason. Hence mysteries had no place in the system, nor were things beyond human comprehension (e. g., the infinity of God) regarded as neces-

sary articles of the Socinian faith. The doctrines of original sin, eternal punishment for actual sin, and infant baptism, were all rejected.

Since the Socinians denied the trinity of Persons in the Godhead, they necessarily rejected the divinity of Christ. Our Lord, they said, though miraculously born, was only the "interpreter of the Divine Will"; but at the same time he was a real mediator—not God, but deified man. "In this sense he was to be adored; and it is here precisely that we have the dividing line between Socinianism and Unitarianism, for the latter system denied the miraculous birth of Christ and refused Him adoration. It must be confessed that, on their principles, the Unitarians were much more logical" (Cath. Encyc., vol. XIV., p. 114).

The Passion of Our Lord, since He was not God, was to be considered only as an earnest of man's pardon. It had no sacrificial value, and consequently the Eucharist, for the Socinians, did not even commemorate the Passion, but was regarded merely as an act of thanksgiving for the pledge of redemption which the Passion gave.

Such were, in the main, the tenets of Socinianism. The Antitrinitarians throughout Europe held all or most of them; the Spaniard Servetus, burnt at the stake by Calvin,* was an exponent of Antitrinitarian views. Faustus Socinus met with some degree of success, albeit temporary, in propagating his doctrines throughout Poland. Long before his advent, however, Lutheranism had made considerable progress among the corrupt nobles of that country, although it failed to win the support of the people. King Sigismund I., who died in 1548, was a firm defender of the old Church, whilst Archbishop Laski of Gnesen was untiring in his efforts to stay the progress of heretical doctrines.

Calvinism was also introduced in its turn, and found several influential supporters. The doctrines of Zwingli, too, had a following. Under King Sigismund II. the sects obtained certain advantageous concessions; but the irreconcilable characters of their several creeds prevented anything like unity of action, and so ultimately

*See pages 131 and 132.

checked their progress. On the Catholic side, the disciplinary measures of the papal legates and the bishops, earnestly seconded by the preaching of the Jesuits, in time removed all just cause for complaint, and before the end of the sixteenth century the Protestant movement in Poland was on the wane.

Hungary

As in so many other countries, the nobility welcomed the Reformation in Hungary. Lutheranism was introduced at an early date. The protagonists of the new religion took advantage of the unsettled state of the kingdom to gain recruits, but there, as in Poland, the introduction of Calvinism brought dissensions which checked the whole Protestant movement. The same thing happened in Transylvania, where Lutherans, Zwinglians, Socinians, and Anabaptists made war on one another whenever possible. Although the present boundaries of the kingdom of Hungary are not the same as those of the sixteenth century, the religious condition of the country today reflects the syncopated progress of the Reformation perfectly. Here are the statistics as returned by the census of 1910:

Catholics, Latin rite	10,888,138
Catholics, Greek rite (Uniates)	2,025,508
Greek Schismatics	2,987,163
Evangelical (Helvetic: Zwinglian)	2,621,329
Evangelical (Augsburg: Lutheran)	1,340,143
Unitarians (Socinian)	74,296
Jews	932,458
All others	17,452
Total	20,866,487

Italy

In some of the larger Italian cities there were small groups of Lutherans and Zwinglians, but nowhere did the Reformation obtain a real foothold. A few Italian Protestants, like Peter Martyr and Faustus Socinus, were leaders in other countries; the former, having spent some time in Switzerland and Alsace, appeared in England early in Elizabeth's reign. The Italian census of 1911 returned a Catholic population of 32,983,664, and a Protestant population of 123,253

Of these 22,500 were members of the Waldensian Church of Piedmont, a sect which antedates the Reformation; 30,000 more belonged to foreign Protestant bodies, whilst only 10,000 belonged to the so-called Italian Evangelical churches, and this in spite of the strenuous "missionary" endeavors of the past forty-five years.

Spain and Portugal

In these two countries the Reformation met with no encouragement. True, a few men, most notable of whom was Servetus, allied themselves with one or another of its phases; but in the very nature of things it could not make converts. In the first place, the eight hundred years' struggle of Christian Spain against Moorish domination had just ended, and in consequence the national loyalty to the Church was intense. Secondly, heresy was regarded as a crime against the state, and so came within the purview of the Inquisition. Thirdly, the political conditions which elsewhere gave an impetus to the movement, did not exist in Spain. Occasionally one meets with a retrospective Protestant writer who regrets that Spain was not won over, and assigns ludicrous reasons for his belief that the Spaniards should have rejected the Catholic religion. For example, Rev. John F. Hurst, D. D., in his Short History of the Reformation (p. 102), gives some consideration to the terrible burden (?) that rested on Spain, in which country, he says, "there were 58 archbishoprics, 684 bishoprics, 11,400 monasteries, 23,000 brotherhoods, 46,000 monks, 13,800 nuns, 312 secular priests, and over 400,000 ecclesiastics of other grades."

The reader is doubtless supposed to conclude that the people should have shaken off this tremendous incubus. But the figures are utterly fictitious. There are not at present in all Europe as many dioceses as Dr. Hurst assigns to sixteenth-century Spain. That country now has nine metropolitan and fifty-two episcopal sees,—a number which differs but little from that of Reformation times. Statements like those of Dr. Hurst, which are common enough, must be ascribed either to woeful ignorance or downright mendacity.

A religious enumeration of the Russian Empire, made in 1897, showed a Protestant population of nearly 3,800,000, of whom 3,572,653 were Lutherans. Most of these were in Finland, but many lived in Livonia and Courland, formerly territories of the Teutonic Knights, which were Protestantized in the same manner as Prussia, another possession of the same order. Finland adopted Lutheranism after the fashion of Sweden, of which country it was formerly a dependent.

* * * * *

This ends our survey of the history of the Reformation in its several aspects, and in the several countries of Europe. We turn now to the movement called the "Counter-Reformation," by which is meant the successful resistance of the Catholic Church to the spread of Protestant doctrines.

* The term "Protestant Revolt" is much more accurate than "Reformation," and so, too, the term "Catholic Reformation" is preferable to "Counter-Reformation." We employ the older designations here, however, because the later and better ones have not yet come into general use.

XXVIII.

The Counter-Reformation; The Council of Trent

We have seen that, in the very first years of the Reformation, the saintly Pope Adrian VI. recognized the need of stern disciplinary reform. Adrian, who had lived many years in Spain, and went thence to Rome when called upon to wear the tiara, brought to Italy that reforming spirit already under way in the former country, where it had been fostered by the illustrious Cardinal Ximenes. We have seen, too, that several attempts were made to summon a General Council, but the wars and disorders of that troubled age prevented such a salutary step until Pope Paul III. at last succeeded, and the Council of Trent met in 1545.

One by one the religious novelties of the time were examined and condemned. The opposite Catholic doctrines were all re-asserted and carefully defined, whilst abuses—especially those relating to Indulgences, the tenure of sees, episcopal visitations, and the like—were condemned unsparingly. Nor did the work stop with mere words. The reforms were systematized in such a manner that ecclesiastical discipline effectively reached every class in the Church, from the court of the Supreme Pontiff himself down to the humblest of the laity. The great synod, though often interrupted by the doings of those unpeaceful times, continued its sessions until December 4, 1563. Its decrees were approved by Pope Pius IV., and those of a doctrinal nature were at once given the greatest publicity. The definitions of the seven sacraments, the sacrificial character of the Mass, Transubstantiation, the validity of Communion in one kind, indulgences, purgatory, and the veneration of the saints received especial attention, since these were the doctrines principally attacked by the Reformers.

The disciplinary decrees met with royal resistance in some countries, notably in France; but on the whole they finally became effective. The Popes of the second half of the sixteenth century were, without exception, single-minded in the interests of the Church. The evil influences of

the Renaissance period disappeared entirely under such men as Pius IV., who enjoyed the support and assistance of his nephew, St. Charles Borromeo, Cardinal, and Archbishop of Milan. His successor, Pius V., was the last Pope to be canonized. After the latter, Gregory XIII., Sixtus V., and Clement VIII. all worked in the same spirit. The liturgical reforms of the Council of Trent were warmly seconded by Pius V. and Clement VIII., and later on by Urban VIII.

The Work of the Religious Orders

A powerful aid to the reforming spirit of the Council was the fervor and devotion of the religious orders. Several new communities were established, among them the Theatines in 1524, and the Barnabites in 1532. To the Jesuits, founded by St. Ignatius Loyola, and approved in 1540 by Pope Paul III., must be given much the larger part of the credit for having turned back the tide of the Reformation. Macaulay, in his Essay on Ranke's History of the Popes, well says that "the history of the order of Jesus is the history of the great Catholic reaction," and that "with what vehemence . . . the Jesuits fought the battles of their Church, is written on every page of the annals of Europe, during several generations." In the seventeenth century the spirit of Trent developed still further in the rise of religious communities devoted to seminary work, missions, charity, and other ends necessitated by the changed condition of Europe. Among these communities were the Sulpicians, founded by M. Olier, and the Vincentians, instituted by St. Vincent de Paul, who also founded the Daughters of Charity to carry on his efforts for the relief of poverty and suffering. All the older orders, revitalized, as it were, took an active part in the great work of true reform which characterized the Church in the second half of the sixteenth century. Great bishops like St. Francis de Sales, who turned back the progress of Calvinism in Geneva, were powerful factors in restoring the prestige of the ancient faith.

Views of the Council of Trent

It has long been the fashion with a certain class of writers, unwillingly cognizant of the fact that the Reformation, so-called, was checked by the

labors of the Council of Trent, to sneer at that body as reactionary, unprogressive, and "medieval." In comment, Hallam remarks:

"It is usual for Protestant writers to inveigh against the Tridentine fathers. I do not assent to their decisions, which is not to the purpose, nor vindicate the intrigues (sic) of the papal party. But I must presume to say that . . . I find proofs of much ability, considering the embarrassments with which they had to struggle, and of an honest desire of reformation among a large body, as to those matters which in their judgment ought to be reformed" (Introduction to the Literature of Europe, Standard ed., vol. I., p. 277, note).

Ranke thus sums up the labors of Trent:

"The council that had been so vehemently demanded, and so long evaded, that had been twice dissolved, had been shaken by so many political storms, and whose third convocation had been beset with danger, closed amid the general harmony of the Catholic world. . . . The faithful were again subjected to the uncompromising discipline of the Church, and in urgent cases, to the sword of excommunication. Seminaries were founded where young ecclesiastics were carefully brought up under strict discipline, and in the fear of God. The parishes were regulated anew, the administration of the sacraments and preaching subjected to fixed ordinances, and the co-operation of the regular clergy subjected to determined laws. The bishops were held rigidly to the duty of their office, especially to the superintendence of the clergy" (History of the Popes, book III.). In comment on Ranke's work, Macaulay aptly remarks that "in the course of a single generation, the whole spirit of the Church of Rome underwent a change. From the halls of the Vatican to the most secluded hermitage of the Apennines, the great revival was everywhere felt and seen."

No Religious Novelties at Trent

It is not an uncommon assertion that the Council of Trent introduced new doctrines. In fact, thoughtless or ignorant non-Catholic writers are quite fond of making this statement. But Hallam, among others, decries as absurd "a strange notion that has been started of late years in England,

that the Council of Trent made important innovations in the established doctrines of the western Church; an hypothesis so paradoxical in respect to public opinion, and, it may be added, so prodigiously at variance with the known facts of ecclesiastical history, that we cannot but admire the facility with which it has been taken up" (op. cit., Vol. II., p. 78, note). This view of a learned Protestant certainly deserves weight with those who picture the Tridentine Fathers as innovators. Hallam goes on to say that the Fathers "had but one leading prejudice, that of determining theological faith according to the tradition of the Catholic Church, as handed down to their own age. This one point of authority conceded, I am not aware that they can be proved to have decided wrong, or at least against all reasonable evidence."

It was unfortunate that the northern nations of Europe were not adequately, if at all, represented in the great synod, since thereby its beneficial results would have been more widespread. But hostile kings and princelings, not to speak of the leaders of the Reformation themselves, were entirely to blame for that. If the Italians gained a greater, and even a preponderating influence in the affairs of the Church, those who allowed themselves to be excluded by their own rulers, had little right to complain. After all is said, the credit of checking the progress of the Reformation must be ascribed to the labors of the Council of Trent, and that of regaining for the Church much of her lost territory, to the splendid activities of the Society of Jesus.

XXIX.

The Treaty of Westphalia

The Thirty Years' War, which was ended by the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, marks the end of the Reformation period properly so-called. It began with the renewal of the claim, supposed to have been disallowed in the Peace of Augsburg,* that Protestants could hold Catholic bishoprics; that Protestant princes could "secularize the lands of the Church within their domains"; it developed into a struggle which lost its religious character when princes and potentates, Protestant and Catholic, united to destroy the power of the house of Austria. The breaking down of other than national lines may be judged by the statement that Gustaf II. Adolf of Sweden, usually known as Gustavus Adolphus, went to the aid of the German Protestants in 1630, his financial affairs having been cared for by Cardinal Richelieu, the minister of Louis XIII. In fact, after 1635 the war was virtually one of France and Sweden against the Emperor Ferdinand II., and was actually if not nominally waged to establish a Protestant ascendancy in Germany. In the end, the French policy triumphed. The Swedes obtained territory in Germany, and secured what seemed to be a system of religious freedom, although in reality the "cujus regio, ejus religio" was firmly fixed. Richelieu accomplished his purpose of preventing a union of the German states, and taking German lands in his own turn. France had now definitely displaced Spain as the leading power of Europe, and, on the whole, the Treaty of Westphalia marks the greatest range, territorially, that Protestantism attained.

Growth of Autocracy

James I. of England had long since enunciated his doctrine of the divine right of kings, and a similar system of royal supremacy soon gained the upper hand in France, under Louis XIV. Since the court of the "Roi-Soleil" was imitated by other princes, absolute monarchy became the rule, and herein is found the most conspicuous

*See page 107.

political effect of the Reformation. So far from establishing political freedom, the Reformation for the time actually killed it, and that because the old authority of the Holy See, once universally exercised, was no longer effective to shield the people from their kings. Since Protestantism supplied nothing to take its place, even that royalty which was nominally Catholic, as in France, soon found itself able to break all bounds of restraint.

As a logical consequence, the Church herself was in time enslaved in their own realms by ambitious monarchs. The reigns of Louis XIV. and Louis XV. marked an ever-widening state ascendancy which tyrannized over people and Church alike, though seeming to hold the latter in its service. The inevitable reaction finally came, and the great Revolution of the end of the eighteenth century swept away every vestige of the old regime, only to exalt in its place the still more intolerable tyranny of the mob. Joseph II. of Austria, the Bourbon kings of Spain and Naples, and the sovereigns of Portugal, all conspired to dominate the Church in the interests of their own houses, and for a time they succeeded. Perhaps in no other period of history has the Holy See been so impotent a factor in the affairs of men as it was in the second half of the eighteenth century, and perhaps at no other time had the tyranny of kings been so dominant. This state of affairs was emphatically the fruit of the Reformation, which first gave to princes in Christian times unrestricted power to do as they pleased.

Charges of Intolerance

Within the Church, the attacks upon her authority necessarily obliged her to act upon the defensive. Consequently she was forced into the semblance of hostility to what nowadays passes for modern progress, and thus was fixed upon her "the reproach of obscurantism." She employed weapons, too, which later historians look upon as altogether unnecessary and disastrous. Doubtless most Catholic writers regret that Pope Paul III., in 1542, established the "Supreme Tribunal of the Inquisition," but that is only saying that they have profited by experiences which Paul

could not foresee. The Popes have no guarantee of infallibility in their government of the Church, and, if a mistake were made in resorting to the Inquisition, the blame should be laid on the age. The Reformers themselves were anything but tolerant, as we have repeatedly shown; and we have shown, too, from Protestant authorities, that persecution was their deadly original sin; that, whilst strenuously advocating in theory the principle of private judgment, in practice they never followed it beyond their own small family circles.

Forces of Disintegration

From the very earliest days of the sects, dogmatic quarrels were their outstanding feature. These have already been dealt with. Socinus and the other Antitrinitarians introduced the spirit of rationalism which ultimately crept into all forms of Protestantism, and which has successively denied article after article formerly deemed essential parts of the Christian faith. Today laditudinarianism is rampant, and dogma is a by-word. The so-called "higher criticism," born of rationalist speculations, has played sad havoc with the old beliefs. In the Boston Herald of December 15, 1905, the Rev. Dr. Charles Edward Stowe is quoted as follows: "Mr. Emerson remarks in his Sovereignty of Ethics: 'Luther would cut his hand off sooner than write theses against the Pope if he suspected he was bringing on with all his might the pale negations of Boston Unitarianism.' In the same spirit and with the same limitations with which Mr. Emerson's remark is to be understood by discriminating readers, I say that our Puritan fathers never would have made the break they did with Catholic Christianity could they have foreseen as the result thereof the Christless, moribund, frigid, fruitless Protestantism that can contribute neither warmth, life, inspiration nor power to lift us above the weight and weariness of sin."

Once the supernatural has been driven out of his religious life, man invariably seeks to find something else to worship. Hence we have seen an exalted humanitarianism pointed to as the end of all human service. In the domain of politics, this course has led to state paternalism,—to the theory that the state is omnipotent, and that there

are no rights superior or antecedent to those of the commonwealth. Concomitantly, we have witnessed the growth of a spirit of exaggerated nationalism,—a spirit which is unquestionably one of the causes of the present war. This spirit is essentially a product of the Reformation, because the Reformation, after all, was not merely the denial of certain articles of Catholic faith, but it was the repudiation of that old ideal of ecclesiastical unity which was once able to judge between the parties to quarrels, and settle their differences in the spirit which recognized all men as members of the one great Christian family. The wars of the Middle Ages never turned upon the idea of universal dominion which has been the pet theory of more than one potentate in the last century and a half.

The Philosophy of the Age

Closely bound up with its vague creeds (we are speaking, of course, of those outside the Church) and over-aggressive politics, is the philosophy of our age. This is something unstable, ever-shifting, disguised in one dress here, in another there. Only a few years ago materialism was the fashion in scientific circles, which now have turned to a sort of pantheistic spiritism, whilst the "uncultured" have adopted as their rule of life a free-and-easy naturalism. The shibboleth of the age is "progress," and no man is able to give a consistent definition of the word. The world-philosophy of our day is the effect of a cause to which the Reformation itself can be traced, and the logical consequences of both may be seen mirrored in the modernism which was condemned ten years ago by our late Holy Father, Pope Pius X.

L'Envoi

It would be a gigantic task indeed to follow the results of the Reformation movement through their thousands of ramifications. The great outstanding effect is the destruction of Christian unity, and in that effect is comprised the multitude of evils that afflict man religiously and politically. Nor has the end been reached yet. Unborn generations will turn from the speculations of today, to seek a sound philosophy of life in speculations which may be even wilder, whilst

the truth which their fathers rejected is within easy reach. If one thing is certain in the light of history, it is this: the Reformation has demonstrated that the promise of her Divine Founder has been verified in the Catholic Church. Though evils beset her in the days of the Renaissance, she shook them off, and healed the wounds they had imprinted upon her; though the Reformers assailed her doctrines, she triumphantly vindicated her tenets, whilst theirs have been abandoned one by one as they have wandered ever farther from the highway of historic Christianity; though the sects claim to be the children of freedom, it is in her fold alone that man is really free, because true freedom depends upon sane recognition of the principle of authority. In this connection, and by way of conclusion, we may quote once more the Protestant Professor A. M. Fairbairn, who says that "the man in search of an authoritative Church may not hesitate; once let him assume that a visible and audible authority is of the essence of religion, and he has no choice; he must become, or get himself reckoned, a Catholic. The Roman Church assails his understanding with invincible logic, and appeals to his imagination with irresistible charms" (Catholicism Roman and Anglican, p. 152).

Professor Fairbairn, however, makes a distinction between the Church as an historic institution and as a divinely commissioned religious teacher. Yet it is impossible, in the light of historical research, so to differentiate. While, therefore, we admire Fairbairn's tribute of praise, we feel bound to quote, by way of complement, the words of Mr. W. H. Mallock: "Year by year, as scientific knowledge increases, and as the consciousness of what it means becomes clearer and more diffused, the intellectual bankruptcy of Protestantism becomes more and more apparent. The position of Rome, on the other hand, is being affected in a precisely opposite way. In exact proportion as Protestantism exhibits its inability to vindicate for itself, either in theory or in practice, any teaching authority which is really an authority at all, the perfection of the Roman system theoretically and practically alike becomes, in this particular respect, more and more striking and obvious. . . . In this way it is then that

modern historical criticism is working to establish, so far as intellectual consistency is concerned, the Roman theory of Christianity, and to destroy the theory of Protestantism, for it shows that Christian doctrine can neither be defined nor verified except by an authority which, as both logic and experience prove, Rome alone can with any plausibility claim" (Nineteenth Century, vol. 46, p. 675).

Errata

On page 6 omit first line.
On Page 29, line 1, for "Petarch" read "Petrarch."
On page 35, line 18, for "Aneas" read "Aeneas."
On page 50, line 9, for "1505" read "1507."

2667